UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
3 1761 01548958 6

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/porcupinesworksc03cobbuoft

547p
19
303

PORCUPINE'S

WORKS;

CONTAINING VARIOUS

WRITINGS AND SELECTIONS,

EXHIBITING A FAITHFUL PICTURE

OF THE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;

OF THEIR

GOVERNMENTS, LAWS, POLITICS, AND RESOURCES;

OF THE CHARACTERS OF THEIR

PRESIDENTS, GOVERNORS, LEGISLATORS, MAGISTRATES, AND MILITARY MEN;

AND OF THE

CUSTOMS, MANNERS, MORALS, RELIGION, VIRTUES AND VICES

OF THE PEOPLE:

COMPRISING ALSO

A COMPLETE SERIES OF HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS AND REMARKS,

FROM THE END OF THE WAR, IN 1783,

TO THE

ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT, IN MARCH, 1801.

152164A
8-9-19

BY WILLIAM COBBETT.

IN TWELVE VOLUMES.

(A Volume to be added annually.)

VOL. III.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR COBBETT AND MORGAN, AT THE CROWN AND MITRE, PALL MALL.

MAY, 1801.

Printed by S. Gosnell,
Little Queen Street, Holborn.

TABLE

OF THE

CONTENTS

OF

VOL. III.

Page

1. *The Political Cenſor, No. I.*; *or, a Review of political Occurrences relative to the United States of America* . . . 7
2. *The Bloody Buoy, thrown out as a Warning to the political Pilots of all Nations*; *or, a faithful Relation of a Multitude of Acts of Barbarity, ſuch as the Eye never witneſſed, the Tongue expreſſed, or the Imagination conceived, until the Commencement of the French Revolution. To which is added an inſtructive Eſſay, tracing theſe dreadful Effects to their real Cauſes* . 79
3. *Political Cenſor, No. II.* . . . 247
4. *Political Cenſor, No. III.* . . . 309
5. *Political Cenſor, No. IV.* . . . 369

THE

CENSOR:

OR, A REVIEW OF

POLITICAL OCCURRENCES

RELATIVE TO THE

UNITED STATES

OF

AMERICA.

INTRODUCTION.

NO one, who has been an attentive obſerver of the violent and dangerous attempts which have been made, and are ſtill making, againſt the Federal Conſtitution, and conſequently againſt the peace, proſperity, and happineſs of our country, can have failed to perceive, that they had their riſe in the deception which has been ſo induſtriouſly circulated through every part of the United States. It is not to be preſumed, indeed, that the leaders in this hoſtile and formidable combination have been deceived: they have long been marſhalled and ready for the attack: but it is the deluſion, which has been quietly ſuffered to ſteal its way among the people, that has called them into the field, and encouraged them to aſſault firſt the outworks, and at laſt the very citadel of our liberties and our lives.

The ſource of this deluſion it is not difficult to diſcover: we have it continually before our eyes: I mean the *public papers*, and I ſpeak with a very few exceptions.

The General Government adopted the moſt effectual meaſures for facilitating the conveyance of information to every quarter of the Union, at the leaſt poſſible expenſe. Hence ſubſcribers to papers were found in abundance; and the editors, ſtriking off numerous impreſſions, were, of courſe, enabled to furniſh them at a low price. The intention

of the Government, as expreſſed by the Preſident himſelf, was certainly the moſt beneficent, that of ſpreading *true* information and *uſeful* knowledge among all claſſes of the community. But what has been the conſequence? Exactly the contrary. The French revolution burſt forth like a volcano, and its devouring lava reached even us. The editors, perceiving the partiality of the moſt *numerous* claſs of their ſubſcribers for this revolution, and all the novel and wild principles it has given riſe to, have been ſeduced, by the love of gain, to flatter that partiality, by extolling thoſe principles at the expenſe of every thing, their own private intereſt excepted. Their papers, which ſwarm like ſummer flies, are become the vehicles of falſehood in place of truth, of ignorance in place of knowledge. Like the tenebrificous ſtars mentioned by a celebrated author, they ſhed darkneſs in place of light.

A veil has been carefully drawn over the diſtreſſes and horrors reſulting from the anarchical ſyſtem of France; or, when this could not be done, when the editors have feared to be anticipated by their fellow-labourers, they have endeavoured to outvie each other in apologies for what ought to have been held up to deteſtation, or, at leaſt, as an awful leſſon to ourſelves. Every one, even of the moſt deſtructive and impious acts of that pretended republic, has been trumpetted forth as the effect of a liberal and enlightened policy; while no inſinuation, no ſubtilty, no audacious falſehood, has been left uneſſayed to thwart all the meaſures of our own mild and wiſe government, to diſfigure its principles, and ſever it from the affections of the people.

To countervail the malignant efforts of theſe retailers has ever been my wiſh; and, I hope, it will not

not be thought preſumption in me, if I believe that the trifles from my pen which the public have honoured with their peruſal, have, in ſome ſlight degree, had the deſired effect. But, alas! what can a ſtraggling pamphlet, neceſſarily confined to a ſingle ſubject, do againſt a hundred thouſand volumes of miſcellaneous falſehood in folio? Their ſheets, if extended, would more than cover the ſurface of our country.

In oppoſing a literary monſter like this, I am aware that a Porcupine, with all his quills, can never hope for complete ſucceſs: but nothing can be accompliſhed without being begun: I hope to call up abler hands to my aid: to me it will be a ſufficient honour to have led the way.

This I ſhall attempt in a monthly work, of the ſame bulk and price as the one which is here ſubmitted to the public. In this work I ſhall take a review of the political tranſactions of the paſt month; give an account of every democratic trick, whether of native growth, or imported from abroad; unravel the windings of the pretended patriots, and more particularly thoſe of the *flour-merchants*; and I truſt I ſhall be enabled to give monthly a ſketch of political affairs more ſatisfactory, becauſe more correct, than has ever yet appeared in this country. Theſe will be the leading objects; but I ſhall exclude nothing not entirely foreign to the nature of the work, that may contribute to the uſe or amuſement of my readers. . .

The newſpapers are ſupported by ſubſcription, and for that very reaſon the *Cenſor* ſhall not. As long as people read, ſo long ſhall I write; and, when the bookſeller advertiſes me that the work lies on his ſhelf, it will be a very good hint for me to draw in my quills.

Here, then, begins a *bellum eternum* between the fabricating *Quidnuncs* and me.—There is my glove, gentlemen; take it up as ſoon as you will. You well know that your abuſe will infinitely redound to my honour; and therefore, to ſilence me, by rendering my work ſteril and unintereſting, you are reduced to the cruel neceſſity of telling the truth.

POLITICAL CENSOR*.

No. I.

Meeting of Congreſs—A Speaker choſen—Preſident's Speech.

MONDAY, *7th December*, 1795.

THE Houſe, being met, proceeded to the choice of a Speaker and a Clerk; when Mr. Jonathan Dayton, one of the Repreſentatives for the State of New-Jerſey, was choſen Speaker, and Mr. John Beckley Clerk.

TUESDAY, *8th December*, 1795.

The Senators and Repreſentatives being aſſembled in the chamber of the latter, the Preſident of the United States entered, took the chair, and opened the ſeſſion with the following ſpeech:

Fellow-citizens of the Senate and Houſe of Repreſentatives,

I truſt I do not deceive myſelf, while I indulge the perſuaſion that I have never met you at any period when, more than at the preſent, the ſituation of our public affairs has afforded juſt cauſe for mutual congratulation, and for inviting you to join with me in profound gratitude to the Author of all good for the numerous and extraordinary bleſſings we enjoy.

* This Number of the Cenſor was originally called *The Proſpect from the Congreſs Gallery*; and as ſuch it has been ſometimes referred to.

The termination of the long, expenſive, and diſtreſſing war, in which we have been engaged with certain Indians north-weſt of the Ohio, is placed in the option of the United States, by a treaty which the Commander of our army has concluded proviſionally with the hoſtile tribes in that region. In the adjuſtment of the terms, the ſatisfaction of the Indians was deemed an object worthy no leſs of the policy than of the liberality of the United States, as the neceſſary baſis of durable tranquillity. The object, it is believed, has been fully attained. The articles agreed upon will immediately be laid before the Senate for their conſideration.

The Creek and Cherokee Indians, who alone of the ſouthern tribes had annoyed our frontiers, have lately confirmed their pre-exiſting treaties with us; and were giving evidence of a ſincere diſpoſition to carry them into effect, by the ſurrender of the priſoners and property they had taken.—But we have to lament, that the fair proſpect in this quarter has been once more clouded by wanton murders, which ſome citizens of Georgia are repreſented to have recently perpetrated on hunting-parties of the Creeks; which have again ſubjected that frontier to diſquietude and danger, which will be productive of further expenſe, and may occaſion more effuſion of blood. Meaſures are purſuing to prevent or mitigate the uſual conſequences of ſuch outrages; and with the hope of their ſucceeding—at leaſt to avert general hoſtility.

A letter from the Emperor of Morocco announces to me his recognition of our treaty made with his father, the late Emperor, and conſequently the continuance of peace with that power. With peculiar ſatisfaction I add, that information has been received from an agent deputed on our part to Algiers, importing, that the terms of a treaty with the Dey and Regency of that country had been adjuſted in ſuch

a manner

a manner as to authorize the expectation of a ſpeedy peace, and the reſtoration of our unfortunate fellow-citizens from a grievous captivity.

The lateſt advices from our Envoy at the Court of Madrid give, moreover, the pleaſing information, that he had received aſſurances of a ſpeedy and ſatisfactory concluſion of his negotiation. While the event, depending upon unjuſtified particulars, cannot be regarded as aſcertained, it is agreeable to cheriſh the expectation of an iſſue, which, ſecuring amicably very eſſential intereſts of the United States, will at the ſame time lay the foundation of laſting harmony with a power whoſe friendſhip we have uniformly and ſincerely deſired to cultivate.

Though not before officially diſcloſed to the Houſe of Repreſentatives, you, Gentlemen, are all apprized, that a treaty of amity, commerce, and navigation, has been negotiated with Great Britain; and that the Senate have adviſed and conſented to its ratification, upon a condition, which excepts part of one article. Agreeably thereto, and to the beſt judgment I was able to form of the public intereſt, after full and mature deliberation, I have added my ſanction. The reſult on the part of his Britannic Majeſty is unknown. When received, the ſubject will, without delay, be placed before Congreſs.

This intereſting ſummary of our affairs, with regard to the foreign powers, between whom and the United States controverſies have ſubſiſted; and with regard alſo to thoſe of our Indian neighbours, with whom we have been in a ſtate of enmity or miſunderſtanding, opens a wide field for conſoling and gratifying reflections. If, by prudence and moderation on every ſide, the extinguiſhment of all the cauſes of external diſcord, which have heretofore menaced our tranquillity, on terms compatible with our national rights and honour, ſhall be the happy reſult;

reſult; how firm and how precious a foundation will have been laid for accelerating, maturing, and eſtabliſhing the proſperity of our country!

Contemplating the internal ſituation, as well as the external relations of the United States, we diſcover equal cauſe for contentment and ſatisfaction. While many of the nations of Europe, with their American dependencies, have been involved in a conteſt unuſually bloody, exhauſting, and calamitous, in which the evils of foreign war have been aggravated by domeſtic convulſion and inſurrection; in which many of the arts moſt uſeful to ſociety have been expoſed to diſcouragement and decay; in which ſcarcity of ſubſiſtence has embittered other ſufferings —while even the anticipation of a return of the bleſſings of peace and repoſe is alloyed by the ſenſe of heavy and accumulating burdens, which preſs upon all the departments of induſtry, and threaten to clog the future ſprings of Government— our favoured country, happy in a ſtriking contraſt, has enjoyed a general tranquillity; a tranquillity the more ſatisfactory, becauſe maintained at the expenſe of no duty. Faithful to ourſelves, we have violated no obligation to others. Our agriculture, commerce, and manufactures proſper beyond former example; the moleſtations of our trade (to prevent a continuance of which, however, very pointed remonſtrances have been made) being overbalanced by the aggregate benefits which it derives from a neutral poſition. Our population advances with a celerity, which, exceeding the moſt ſanguine calculations, proportionally augments our ſtrength and reſources, and guarantees our future ſecurity. Every part of the Union diſplays indications of rapid and various improvement: and with burdens ſo light as ſcarcely to be perceived; with reſources fully adequate to our preſent exigencies; with Governments founded on the genuine principles of rational liberty, and with mild

and wholeſome laws; is it too much to ſay, that our country exhibits a ſpectacle of national happineſs never ſurpaſſed, if ever before equalled?

Placed in a ſituation every way auſpicious, motives of commanding force impel us, with ſincere acknowledgment to Heaven, and pure love to our country, to unite our efforts to preſerve, prolong, and improve our immenſe advantages. To co-operate with you in this deſirable work, is a fervent and favourite wiſh of my heart.

It is a valuable ingredient in the general eſtimate of our welfare, that the part of our country which was lately the ſcene of diſorder and inſurrection, now enjoys the bleſſings of quiet and order. The miſled have abandoned their errors, and pay the reſpect to our conſtitution and laws, which is due from good citizens to the public authorities of the ſociety. Theſe circumſtances have induced me to pardon, generally, the offenders here referred to; and to extend forgiveneſs to thoſe who had been adjudged to capital puniſhment. For though I ſhall always think it a ſacred duty to exerciſe with firmneſs and energy the conſtitutional powers with which I am veſted; yet it appears to me no leſs conſiſtent with the public good, than it is with my perſonal feelings, to mingle in the operations of Government every degree of moderation and tenderneſs, which the national juſtice, dignity, and ſafety may permit.

Gentlemen,

Among the objects which will claim your attention in the courſe of the ſeſſion, a review of our military eſtabliſhment is not the leaſt important. It is called for by the events which have changed, and may be expected ſtill further to change, the relative ſituation of our frontiers. In this review, you will doubtleſs allow due weight to the conſideration that the queſtions between us and certain foreign powers

are

are not yet finally adjuſted; that the war in Europe is not yet terminated; and that our weſtern poſts, when recovered, will demand proviſion for garriſoning and ſecuring them. A ſtatement of our preſent military force will be laid before you by the department of war.

With the review of our army eſtabliſhment is naturally connected that of the militia. It will merit inquiry, what imperfections in the exiſting plan, further experience may have unfolded. The ſubject is of ſo much moment in my eſtimation, as to excite a conſtant ſolicitude, that the conſideration of it may be renewed, till the greateſt attainable perfection ſhall be accompliſhed. Time is wearing away ſome advantages for forwarding the object, while none better deſerves the perſevering attention of the public councils.

While we indulge the ſatisfaction which the actual condition of our weſtern borders ſo well authorizes, it is neceſſary that we ſhould not loſe ſight of an important truth, which continually receives new confirmations, namely, that the proviſions heretofore made with a view to the protection of the Indians from the violences of the lawleſs part of our frontier inhabitants are inſufficient. It is demonſtrated that theſe violences can now be perpetrated with impunity. And it can need no argument to prove, that unleſs the murdering of Indians can be reſtrained, by bringing the murderers to condign puniſhment, all the exertions of the Government to prevent deſtructive retaliations by the Indians will prove fruitleſs, and all our preſent agreeable proſpects illuſory. The frequent deſtruction of innocent women and children, who are chiefly the victims of retaliation, muſt continue to ſhock humanity; and cauſe an enormous expenſe to drain the treaſury of the Union.

To

To enforce upon the Indians the obſervance of juſtice, it is indiſpenſable that there ſhall be competent means of rendering juſtice to them. If theſe means can be deviſed by the wiſdom of Congreſs, and eſpecially if there can be added an adequate proviſion for ſupplying the neceſſities of the Indians, on reaſonable terms (a meaſure, the mention of which I the more readily repeat, as in all the conferences with them they urge it with ſolicitude), I ſhould not heſitate to entertain a ſtrong hope of rendering our tranquillity permanent. I add with pleaſure, that the probability even of their civilization is not diminiſhed by the experiments which have been thus far made, under the auſpices of Government. The accompliſhment of this work, if practicable, will reflect undecaying luſtre on our national character, and adminiſter the moſt grateful conſolations that virtuous minds can know.

Gentlemen of the Houſe of Repreſentatives,

The ſtate of our revenue, with the ſums which have been borrowed and reimburſed, purſuant to different acts of Congreſs, will be ſubmitted from the proper departments; together with an eſtimate of the appropriations neceſſary to be made for the ſervice of the enſuing year.

Whether meaſures may not be adviſable to reinforce the proviſion for the redemption of the public debt, will naturally engage your examination. Congreſs have demonſtrated their ſenſe to be, and it were ſuperfluous to repeat mine, that whatſoever will tend to accelerate the honourable extinction of our public debt, accords as much with the true intereſt of our country, as with the general ſenſe of our conſtituents.

Gentlemen of the Senate and
Houſe of Repreſentatives,

The ſtatements which will be laid before you relative to the mint, will ſhow the ſituation of that inſtitution;

inſtitution; and the neceſſity of ſome further legiſlative proviſions, for carrying the buſineſs of it more completely into effect; and for checking abuſes which appear to be ariſing in particular quarters.

The progreſs in providing materials for the frigates, and in building them; the ſtate of the fortifications of our harbours; the meaſures which have been purſued for obtaining proper ſites for arſenals, and for repleniſhing our magazines with military ſtores; and the ſteps which have been taken towards the execution of the law for opening a trade with the Indians; will likewiſe be preſented for the information of Congreſs.

Temperate diſcuſſion of the important ſubjects which may ariſe in the courſe of the ſeſſion, and mutual forbearance where there is a difference of opinion, are too obvious and neceſſary for the peace, happineſs, and welfare of our country, to need any recommendation of mine.

United States,
8*th Dec.* 1795.

Remarks.—The Preſident's ſituation was at this time almoſt entirely new. Never, till a few months preceding this ſeſſion, had the tongue of the moſt factious ſlander dared to make a public attack on his character. This was the firſt time he had ever entered the walls of Congreſs without a full aſſurance of meeting a welcome from every heart. He now ſaw, even among thoſe to whom he addreſſed himſelf, numbers who were ready to thwart his meaſures, and preſent him the cup of humiliation, filled to the brim.

Debate

Debate (in the Senate) on the Addreſs to the Preſident in Anſwer to his Speech.*

FRIDAY, *Dec.* 11.

The addreſs in anſwer to the Preſident's ſpeech was taken up by paragraphs.

The two laſt clauſes but one, which are as follows, were moved to be ſtruck out by Mr. Maſon:

"The intereſting proſpect of our affairs with regard to the foreign powers, between whom and the United States controverſies have ſubſiſted, is not more ſatisfactory than the review of our internal ſituation: if from the former we derive an expectation of the extinguiſhment of all the cauſes of external diſcord that have heretofore endangered our tranquillity, and on terms conſiſtent with our national honour and ſafety, in the latter we diſcover thoſe numerous and wide-ſpread tokens of proſperity, which in ſo peculiar a manner diſtinguiſh our happy country.

"Circumſtances thus every way auſpicious demand our gratitude and ſincere acknowledgments to Almighty God, and require that we ſhould unite our efforts in imitation of your enlightened example, to eſtabliſh and preſerve the peace, freedom, and proſperity of our country."

Mr. MASON obſerved, that he had hoped, nothing contained in the addreſs reported as an anſwer to the Preſident's ſpeech, would have been ſuch as to force the Senate to precipitate deciſions. The two clauſes he objected to diſappointed him in that hope. They were calculated to bring again into view the important ſubject which occupied the Senate during their June ſeſſion. This he conceived would an-

* When no mention is made of the Houſe in which the debate has taken place, the reader will pleaſe to obſerve, that it is meant in the Houſe of Repreſentatives.

ſwer

ſwer no good purpoſe; the minority on that occaſion were not now to be expected to recede from the opinion they then held; and they could not therefore join in the indirect ſelf-approbation which the majority appeared to wiſh for, and which was moſt certainly involved in the two clauſes which he hoped would be ſtruck out. If his motion were agreed to, the remainder of the addreſs would, in his opinion, ſtand unexceptionable. He did not ſee, for his part, that our ſituation is every way auſpicious. Notwithſtanding the treaty, our trade is grievouſly moleſted.

Mr. King obſerved, that the principal features obſervable in the anſwer reported to the Preſident's addreſs, were, to keep up that harmony of intercourſe which ought to ſubſiſt between the Legiſlature and the Preſident, and to expreſs confidence in the undiminiſhed firmneſs and love of country which always characterize our chief executive magiſtrate. He objected to ſtriking out eſpecially the firſt clauſe, becauſe founded on undeniable truth. It only declares, that our proſpects, as to our external relations, are not more ſatisfactory, than a review of our internal ſituation would prove. Was not this repreſentation true, he aſked; could it be controverted? This clauſe, he contended, contained nothing reaſonably objectionable; it did not ſay as much as the ſecond, to which only moſt of the objections of the Member up before him applied, an anſwer to which he ſhould defer, expecting that a queſtion would be put on each in order.

The clauſe, he ſaid, appeared to him drawn up in ſuch terms as could not offend the niceſt feelings of the minority on the important deciſion in June; it was particularly circumſpect and cautious. If liable to objection, it was in not going as far as the truth would warrant.

Some

Some converſation took place as to the mode required, by order, for putting the queſtion; whether it ſhould not be put on each clauſe ſeparately, or whether upon ſtriking out both at once.

The Chair requeſted that the motion ſhould be reduced to writing. Mr. Maſon accordingly reduced it to writing, and it went to ſtriking out both clauſes at once.

Mr. MASON agreed moſt cordially that the ſituation of our external relations was not more a cauſe of joy than our ſituation at home. But the obvious meaning of the clauſe he conceived was an indirect approval of our ſituation relative to external concerns; and to this he could not give his aſſent, as he did not conſider their aſpect as proſperous or auſpicious.

Mr. BUTLER ſaid, that when the Committee was appointed to draft an anſwer, he hoped they would have uſed ſuch general terms as to have ſecured an unanimous vote. He was willing to give the Chief Magiſtrate ſuch an anſwer, as reſpect to his ſtation entitled him to, but not ſuch a one as would do violence to his regard for the conſtitution and his duty to his conſtituents. He could not approve of long and detailed anſwers, however unexceptionable the ſpeech might be in matter, and however reſpectable the character might be from whom it came. He had hoped, from the peculiar ſituation of the country, and of the Senate, that nothing would have been brought forward in the anſwer on the ſubject which agitated the June executive ſeſſion, calculated to wound the feelings of members. He had been diſappointed; it was evident, that ſome members of the Senate could not give their vote in favour of the addreſs in its preſent ſhape, without involving themſelves in the moſt palpable inconſiſtency.

He had long ſince, for his own part, declared himſelf againſt every article of the treaty, becauſe in no inſtance was it bottomed on reciprocity, the only honourable baſis. After this declaration, how could he, or thoſe who coincided in opinion with him, agree to the preſent addreſs without involving themſelves in the moſt palpable inconſiſtency?

He did not agree with the Gentleman of New-York, in his expoſition of the meaning of the clauſes objected to. They certainly declare our ſituation as to our external relations to be favourable. Our ſituation, as far as it reſpects Great Britain, he contended was not in the leaſt ameliorated. —Their depredations on our commerce have not been leſs frequent of late than at any other period ſince the beginning of her war with France. Her orders for the ſeizure of all our veſſels laden with proviſions cannot ſurely be a ſubject for congratulation. When it became authenticated that our trade was relieved from theſe embarraſſments, then he was confident members of Senate, who were with him in ſentiment, would readily expreſs their ſatisfaction at the auſpicious proſpect opened for this country to the enjoyments of tranquillity and happineſs. But until that happy time ſhould arrive, he could not give his voice to deceive the inhabitants of the United States, remote from the ſources of information, to hoodwink them by ſanctioning with his vote a ſtatement unwarranted by truth, and preſenting to them a picture of public happineſs not ſanctioned by fact.

The ſentence objected to, notwithſtanding the explanation of the Gentleman from New-York, appeared to him ſo worded as to lead the citizens at large to believe that the ſpoliations on our commerce were drawing to a fortunate cloſe. This was not, he conceived, warranted by the exiſting ſtate of things. Indeed he proteſted, he knew no more of

the actual ſituation of the treaty negotiation, than the remoteſt farmer in the Union : could he then declare, he aſked, that it was drawing to a happy cloſe ? Indeed, from the lateſt information received, far from our ſituation having been ameliorated by the negotiation of our Executive, he conceived our trade as much in jeopardy as ever.

As to the internal proſperity, he owned there was ſome cauſe for congratulation ; but even in this his conviction could not carry him as far as the clauſes in the addreſs ſeemed to go. In a pecuniary point of view the country had made a viſible progreſs ; but he ſaw in it no baſis of permanent proſperity. There were no circumſtances attendant on it, that gave a fair hope that the proſperity would be permanent. The chief cauſe of our temporary pecuniary proſperity is the war in Europe, which occaſions the high prices our produce at preſent commands : when that is terminated, thoſe advantageous prices will of courſe fall.

Mr. Butler came now to ſpeak of the ſecond objectionable clauſe. He regretted whenever a queſtion was brought forward that involved perſonality in the moſt indirect manner. He wiſhed always to ſpeak to ſubjects, unconnected with men ; but the wording of the clauſe was unfortunately ſuch as to render alluſion to official character unavoidable. He objected principally to the epithet *firm* introduced in the latter clauſe as applied to the ſupreme Executive. Why *firmneſs ?* he aſked. To what ? or to whom ? Is it the *manly* demand of reſtitution made of Great Britain for her accumulated injuries, that called forth the praiſe ? For his own part he could diſcern no firmneſs there. Is it for the *undaunted* and *energetic* countenance of the cauſe of France, in her ſtruggle for freeing herſelf from deſpotic ſhackles ? He ſaw no *firmneſs* diſplayed on that occaſion. Where then is it to be found ? Was it in

the oppoſition of the minority of the Senate and the general voice of the people againſt the treaty that that *firmneſs* was diſplayed? "If it is that "*firmneſs* in oppoſing the will of the people, which "is intended to be extolled, the vote ſhall never, ſaid Mr. Butler, "leave the walls of this Senate "with *my* approbation."

He could not approve, he ſaid, of that *firmneſs* that prompted the Executive to reſiſt the unequivocal voice of his fellow-citizens from New-Hampſhire to Georgia. He would have applauded the firmneſs of the Preſident, if, in compliance with the unequivocal wiſh of the people, he had reſiſted the voice of the majority of the Senate, and refuſed his ſignature to the treaty.

This was, he underſtood (and it ſhould be mentioned to the honour of the Preſident), his firſt intention—Why he changed it, time, he ſaid, muſt diſcloſe.

He concluded by propoſing an amendment to be ſubſtituted in lieu of the objectionable clauſes, ſhould they be ſtruck out.

Mr. Read ſaid, he was not in the habit of giving a ſilent vote; and as many of his conſtituents were averſe to the inſtrument to which he had given his aſſent, he thought this a fit opportunity to ſay ſomething on the ſubject.

Gentlemen on the other ſide had ſpoken of their feelings: did they ſuppoſe, he aſked, that thoſe who were in the majority had not feelings? Alſo, Gentlemen declared, they would not recede from their former determinations; did they expect that the majority would recede?

He had, he ſaid, taken the queſtion of the treaty in all its aſpects, and conſidered it maturely; and though he lamented that he differed in opinion on that ſubject with his colleague, and a portion of the people of his State, he nevertheleſs remained con-

vinced that the ratification of it was adviſable: it reſcued the country from war and its deſolating horrors.

After reading that part of the Preſident's ſpeech to which the clauſes objected to were an echo, he aſked, whether any one could ſay, under the conviction that the meaſures of Government had prevented a war, that a view of our foreign relations was not conſolatory? On all hands, he obſerved, the idea of a war was deprecated; both ſides of the Houſe wiſhed to avoid it: then is it not a conſolatory reflection to all, that its horrors have been averted? Is there a man, who does not believe, that, had the treaty not been ratified, we ſhould have had war? If the country had been plunged into a war, would it be as flouriſhing as it is? The trifling vexations our commerce has ſuſtained are not to be compared to the evils of a ſtate of hoſtility. What good end could have been anſwered by a war?—The addreſs, in the part under diſcuſſion, ſays no more, than that we rejoice at the proſpect that the bleſſings of peace will be preſerved; and does not this expectation exiſt?

Great Britain, in the plenitude of her power, had availed herſelf of the rights ſhe had under the law of nations, of ſeizing enemies' goods in neutral veſſels; but has allowed compenſation to ſome Americans; and a ſyſtem of mild meaſures on our part is the beſt ſecurity for further.

He adverted to that part of Mr. Butler's obſervations, which related to the probable fall of proviſions at the peace. We ought not to be grieved if Europe was rid of the calamities of war at that price. But he contended, that from the meaſures of Adminiſtration permanent advantages were ſecured to this country. The value of our ſoil has been enhanced; wealth has poured in from various parts of

the globe, and many permanent advantages are ſecured.

There had been one aſſertion made, which by repetition had by ſome almoſt been taken for granted, but which required proof to induce him to believe it; and that was, that a majority of the citizens of the United States are oppoſed to the treaty. In the part of the country he came from he owned there might be a majority of that opinion, but he believed the contrary of the United States at large: he expreſſed a conviction, that when his conſtituents came to conſider the meaſure maturely they would change their opinions; and, indeed, underſtood that the falſe impreſſions by which they were at firſt actuated were already wearing off.

But the Senate and Preſident are the conſtitutional treaty-making powers. If miſtaken in their deciſions, they cannot be accuſed of having been miſled by ſudden and immature impreſſions. He ſhould conceive himſelf unfit to fill a chair in Senate if he ſuffered himſelf to be carried away by ſuch impreſſions. The people could not, in their town meetings, deprived of proper information, poſſibly form an opinion that deſerved weight; and it was the duty of the Executive not to be ſhaken in their determination by tumultuous proceedings from without. Upon this ground he much approved the Preſident's conduct, and thought it entitled to the epithet *firm*.

In local queſtions, affecting none but the intereſts of his conſtituents, he ſhould attend to their voice; but on great national points he did not conſider himſelf as a repreſentative from South Carolina, but as ſenator for the Union. In queſtions of this laſt kind, even if the wiſhes of his conſtituents were unequivocally made known to him, he ſhould not conceive himſelf bound to ſacrifice his opinions to theirs.—He viewed the Preſident as ſtanding in this ſituation;

ſituation; and though he might hear the opinions of the people from every part of the United States, he ſhould not ſacrifice to them his own conviction: in this line of conduct he has ſhown his *firmneſs*, and deſerves to be complimented for it by the Senate.

The addreſs reported, he ſaid, contained nothing that would wound the feelings of any member. The Senate would not, in his opinion, act improperly if they expreſſed opinions in coincidence with their act in June ſeſſion. The feelings of the majority ſhould be as much conſulted as thoſe of the minority. The minority are not aſked to retract; but there is a propriety in the Senate's going as far in their addreſs as the ſpeech went, though it ſhould be ſtyled a vote of ſelf-approbation. He hoped the clauſes would not be ſtruck out.

Mr. ELLSWORTH was oppoſed to ſtriking out. The clauſe records a fact, and, if ſtruck out, the Senate deny it. The Preſident aſſerts it; in the addreſs reported, the Senate aſſent: a motion is made to ſtrike out; is it becauſe the truth of it is doubted? It cannot be called an unimportant fact, therefore its omiſſion will not be imputed to overſight. The latter part of the clauſe expreſſes our gratitude to Almighty God. Will the Senate refuſe to make an acknowledgment of that kind? Do they not admit that he is the ſource of all good, and can they refuſe to acknowledge it? And if ſo, is it poſſible, that, in admitting the fact, and expreſſing the ſentiment which ſo naturally flows from it, the Senate would wound the feelings of any friend to his country?

The truth of the fact is as clear as that the ſun now ſhines; the ſentiment is unexceptionable: he therefore recommended to his friend the mover, not to inſiſt upon ſtriking out merely, but that he ſhould vary the motion, and propoſe a ſubſtitute.

To bring the mind to the point with preciſion, it was neceſſary to attend to the wording of the clauſe.

He read it. As to the ſignification of that part which relates to our foreign concerns, he did not conſider it as hypothetical, but a poſitive declaration of a conviction that their ſituation is ſatisfactory; and on that ground he wiſhed to meet the queſtion.

The clauſe objected to, expreſſes an expectation that the cauſes of external diſagreement which have unhappily exiſted will be peaceably done away. He ſaid he had that expectation; many had it not. Thoſe who have it not will negative the clauſe, thoſe who have it will vote in its favour: the reſult will be the ſenſe of a majority. The Senate could not be expected, more than on other occaſions, to be unanimous. If the declarations contained in thoſe clauſes are ſupported, they will be conſidered as the ſenſe of the majority of Senate: others may diſſent; but becauſe unanimity could not be obtained, it was no reaſon why the majority ſhould give a virtual negative to the declaration which they conceived founded on truth.

He examined in detail the ſituation of our external relations, to ſhow the foundation on which he reſted his expectation of a ſatisfactory arrangement of them, and of our general proſperity in that reſpect. With Morocco our treaties are renewed. With Algiers aſſurances are given by the Executive that a peace is not far diſtant. With Spain, on the ſame authority it is underſtood, that our proſpects are favourable in that quarter. With the hitherto hoſtile Indians, a peace is within reach; and the only quarter in which doubt can ariſe is from Great Britain. But even with reſpect to that nation his expectation was, that our differences there would terminate amicably; and he believed this to be the expectation of the Senate, as a collective body.

Mr. Ellsworth then went into the examination of ſome other parts of the clauſe objected to, and vindicated

vindicated the propriety of the epithets *enlightened, firm, perſevering*; and concluded by lamenting that there exiſted a difference of opinion; but hoped that this would not deter the majority from an expreſſion of their ſenſe.

Mr. TAZEWELL ſaid, the diſcuſſion had taken a turn different from that which he expected when he heard the motion. He underſtood the motion at the time it was made, and ſtill ſo underſtood it, as not intending to queſtion the propriety of any thing which was contained in the Preſident's communication to both Houſes of Congreſs. But from what had been ſaid (by Mr. Read of S. C.), that part of the anſwer to the Preſident's communications which had given riſe to the motion, was intended to have a further operation than he originally believed. He aſked what had given riſe to the practice of returning an anſwer of any kind to the Preſident's communications to Congreſs in the form of an addreſs. There was nothing, he ſaid, in the Conſtitution, or in any of the fundamental rules of the Federal Government, which required that ceremony from either branch of the Congreſs. The practice was but an imitation of the ceremonies uſed upon like occaſions in other countries, and was neither required by the Conſtitution, nor authorized by the principles upon which our Government was erected.—But having obtained, he did not intend now to diſturb it.—To allow the utmoſt latitude to the principle which had begotten the practice, it could only tolerate the ceremony as a compliment to the Chief Magiſtrate. It could not be permitted to foreſtall opinions previous to regular diſcuſſions, nor to operate as a mean of pledging members to the purſuit of a particular courſe, which ſubſequent and more full inquiries might ſhow to be extremely improper.

Every anſwer, therefore, to the Preſident's communications ought to be drawn in terms extremely general,

general, neither ſeducing the Preſident into a belief that this Houſe would purſue a general recommendation into points not at firſt contemplated by them, nor pledging themſelves to the world that that ſtate of things was juſt which time had not permitted them thoroughly to examine. The clauſes now under conſideration had at leaſt, in one inſtance, deviated from this principle. They declare to the world—"That the intereſting proſpect of our affairs with regard to the foreign powers, between whom and the United States controverſies have ſubſiſted, is not more ſatisfactory than the review of our internal ſituation." The communications from the Preſident have not uttered ſo bold a ſentiment, nor is there any thing in thoſe communications that juſtifies the aſſertion of this fact. Placing the treaty with Great Britain out of the queſtion, which ſeems to have been the uppermoſt conſideration when this ſentence was penned, the ſeizure of our proviſion veſſels ſince the ſignature of that treaty, and the unwarrantable impriſonment of our ſeamen, are acts which cloud our proſperity and happineſs. The minds of the Americans muſt be brought to conſider theſe things as trivial incidents in our political affairs, before the ſentence under conſideration can be approved. He ſaid he muſt therefore vote for the motion to ſtrike out the two clauſes of the anſwer, in order that ſome fit expreſſions might then be introduced to ſucceed them. He hoped the anſwer might be couched in terms juſt and delicate towards the Preſident, without wounding the feelings of any Senator; and he believed both might be done without any difficulty after the two clauſes were expunged.

The motion for ſtriking out being put, was negatived.

NOES.

Meſſrs. Bingham,	Livermore,
Cabot,	Marſhall,
Ellſworth,	Paine,
Foſter,	Read,
Frelinghuyſen,	Roſs,
King,	Strong,
Latimer,	Trumbull—14.

AYES.

Meſſrs. Bloodworth,	Martin,
Brown,	Maſon,
Butler,	Robinſon,
Langdon,	Tazewell—8.

After a further attempt to amend the addreſs, againſt which the Senate divided—15 and 7, the addreſs was agreed to—14 to 8.

THE ADDRESS.

To the Preſident of the United States.

SIR,

It is with peculiar ſatisfaction that we are informed by your Speech to the two Houſes of Congreſs, that the long and expenſive war in which we have been engaged with the Indians north-weſt of the Ohio, is in a ſituation to be finally terminated; and though we view with concern the danger of an interruption of the peace ſo recently confirmed with the Creeks, we indulge the hope, that the meaſures that you have adopted to prevent the ſame, if followed by thoſe legiſlative proviſions that juſtice and humanity equally demand, will ſucceed in laying the foundation of a laſting peace with the Indian tribes

tribes on the ſouthern as well as on the weſtern frontiers.

The confirmation of our treaty with Morocco, and the adjuſtment of a treaty of peace with Algiers, in conſequence of which our captive fellow-citizens ſhall be delivered from ſlavery, are events that will prove no leſs intereſting to the public humanity, than they will be important in extending and ſecuring the navigation and commerce of our country.

As a juſt and equitable concluſion of our depending negotiations with Spain will eſſentially advance the intereſt of both nations, and thereby cheriſh and confirm the good underſtanding and friendſhip which we have at all times deſired to maintain, it will afford us real pleaſure to receive an early confirmation of our expectations on this ſubject.

The intereſting proſpect of our affairs with regard to the foreign powers, between whom and the United States controverſies have ſubſiſted, is not more ſatisfactory than the review of our internal ſituation: if from the former we derive an expectation of the extinguiſhment of all the cauſes of external diſcord, that have heretofore endangered our tranquillity, and on terms conſiſtent with our national honour and ſafety, in the latter we diſcover thoſe numerous and wide-ſpread tokens of proſperity, which in ſo peculiar a manner diſtinguiſh our happy country.

Circumſtances thus every way auſpicious demand our gratitude and ſincere acknowledgments to Almighty God, and require that we ſhould unite our efforts, in imitation of your enlightened, firm, and perſevering example, to eſtabliſh and preſerve the peace, freedom, and proſperity of our country.

The objects which you have recommended to the notice of the Legiſlature, will in the courſe of the ſeſſion receive our careful attention; and with a true zeal for the public welfare, we ſhall cheerfully co-

operate

operate in every meaſure that ſhall appear to us beſt calculated to promote the ſame.

JOHN ADAMS, Vice-Preſident of the United States, and Preſident of the Senate.

Dec. 12, 1795.

To which the Preſident was pleaſed to make the following Reply.

GENTLEMEN,

With real pleaſure I receive your addreſs, recognifing the proſperous ſituation of our public affairs, and giving aſſurances of your careful attention to the objects demanding legiſlative conſideration; and that, with a true zeal for the public welfare, you will cheerfully co-operate in every meaſure which ſhall appear to you beſt calculated to promote the ſame.

But I derive peculiar ſatisfaction from your concurrence with me in the expreſſions of gratitude to Almighty God, which a review of the auſpicious circumſtances that diſtinguiſh our happy country has excited; and I truſt that the ſincerity of our acknowledgments will be evidenced by a union of efforts to eſtabliſh and preſerve its peace, freedom, and proſperity. G. WASHINGTON.

Debate on the Manner of preſenting the Addreſs in Anſwer to the Preſident's Speech.

WEDNESDAY, *9th December*, 1795.

The Houſe of Repreſentatives went into a Committee of the whole Houſe, on the ſpeech of the Preſident, Mr. Muhlenberg in the chair. The Clerk then read the ſpeech.

Mr. VANS MURRAY *(Maryland)* next moved that a Committee ſhould be appointed to draw up a reſpectful addreſs in anſwer to the ſpeech. The reſolution was in theſe words:

" Reſolved,

"Reſolved, That it is the opinion of this Committee, that a reſpectful addreſs ought to be preſented by the Houſe of Repreſentatives to the Preſident of the United States, in anſwer to his ſpeech to both Houſes of Congreſs, at the commencement of this ſeſſion, containing aſſurances, that this Houſe will take into conſideration the various and important matters recommended to their attention."

Mr. SEDGWICK *(Maſſachuſetts)* ſeconded the motion.

Mr. PARKER *(Virginia)* offered an amendment, which was ſeconded by Mr. Macon (*N. C.*).

The ſubſtance of this amendment was to ſtrike out all that part of the reſolution which goes before the word *aſſurances*; in place of which Mr. Parker propoſed to appoint a Committee, who ſhould perſonally wait on the Preſident, and aſſure him of the attention of the Houſe, &c. and concluding as above. Mr. Parker had the higheſt reſpect for the Preſident; but he had always diſapproved of this practice of making out addreſſes in anſwer to theſe ſpeeches, and of the Houſe leaving their buſineſs to go in a body to preſent them. Laſt ſeſſion the framing of this addreſs had coſt very long debates, and produced very great irritation. Some of the moſt diſagreeable things that happened during the ſeſſion, occurred in theſe debates. He wiſhed unanimity, and the diſpatch of buſineſs, and ſo could not conſent that any addreſs ſhould be drawn up, as he preferred ending the affair at once by ſending a Committee with a verbal anſwer.

Mr. MURRAY replied, that the practice of drawing up ſuch an addreſs was coeval with the conſtitution. It was conſiſtent with good ſenſe, and he did not ſee that any arguments had been employed by the Gentlemen who ſpoke laſt againſt it. It was true that the Houſe might ſend a verbal anſwer, and it

it was likewiſe true that the Preſident might have ſent them his ſpeech by his Secretary, without coming near them at all. He had come to Congreſs, and Mr. Murray could perceive no impropriety in Congreſs returning the compliment by waiting on him.

The Committee divided on the amendment propoſed by Mr. Parker. Eighteen members roſe in ſupport of it; ſo it was loſt. The Committee then agreed to the reſolution, as offered by Mr. Murray. They roſe, and the Chairman reported progreſs. The reſolution was agreed to by the Houſe. The next queſtion was, of how many members the ſelect Committee ſhould conſiſt, that were to be employed in framing a draft of the addreſs. The different numbers of *five* and *three* were propoſed. A diviſion took place on the former motion, when only thirty-one gentlemen roſe in its favour. The motion for a Committee of three members to report an addreſs was of courſe carried. Mr. Madiſon, Mr. Sedgwick, and Mr. Sitgreaves, were appointed.

Remarks.—Here was a direct attempt on the part of *Mr. Parker* to ſet aſide a reſpectful cuſtom, which was coeval with the operation of the Conſtitution of the United States. One would imagine that this inſtrument was grown out of favour with the Member from Virginia; but we ſhall be leſs ſurpriſed at this, when we come, by and by, to ſee the inſtructions of his State to its Senators in Congreſs.

Debate on the Addreſs in Anſwer to the Speech.

Tuesday, *15th December*, 1795.

The Houſe went into a Committee on the report of the ſelect Committee of an addreſs in anſwer to the Preſident's ſpeech.

The following paragraph gave riſe to ſome diſcuſſion:

" Contem-

"Contemplating that *probably unequalled* ſpectacle of national happineſs which our country exhibits in the intereſting ſummary which you, Sir, have been pleaſed to make, in juſtice to our own feelings, permit us to add the benefits which are derived from your preſiding in our councils, *reſulting as well from the* UNDIMINISHED *confidence of your fellow-citizens, as from your zealous and ſucceſsful labours in their ſervice.*"

Mr. PARKER *(Virginia)* moved to ſtrike out the words *probably unequalled*; which was carried, 43 againſt 39.

He then moved to ſtrike out from the word *reſulting* to the end of the paragraph.

Mr. MURRAY (who, as the Chairman, was about to put the queſtion on Mr. Parker's motion) ſaid, that he could not, in juſtice to the opinions of his conſtituents, &c. of the State of Maryland at large, give a ſilent vote. He would ſtate to the Committee a recent fact that warranted him in declaring that the Preſident poſſeſſed, in the ampleſt manner, the confidence of the citizens of Maryland. The Legiſlature of that State, probably foreſeeing the efforts of certain perſons to diminiſh the confidence of the public in the Chief Magiſtrate, had paſſed a reſolution which appears to have been unanimous, by which they declare to the world the moſt perfect confidence in the Preſident.

This fact, though known certainly to many, might not be known to all preſent; and as in this ſolemn teſtimony of approbation and confidence he totally coincided, he could neither be entirely ſilent when a queſtion like this implies the contrary ſentiment, nor withhold from Gentlemen a great fact ſo recently diſplaying the undiminiſhed confidence of the State of Maryland.

Mr. GILES *(Virginia)* hoped that the latter amendment would not take any diſagreeable turn.

He

He was not prepared to go at length into the propoſitions. He did not think it inconſiſtent with all due reſpect for the Preſident to ſhorten this clauſe.

A Member propoſed to reſtrict this amendment to merely ſtriking out the word *undiminiſhed*.

Mr. HARPER *(S. Carolina)* thought the Preſident as wiſe, as honeſt, and faithful a public ſervant as poſſibly could be. He was not prepared to ſay that the Preſident was as popular as he formerly has been, but there is no doubt of his being reinſtated in the confidence of the public. Mr. Harper was confident that four fifths of us ſtill truſt in him. But Mr. Harper thought that objections might be made to the clauſe as it now ſtands; and he deſigned, when the preſent queſtion had been diſcuſſed, to move an amendment.

Mr. PARKER informed the Houſe, that, with much reſpect for the Preſident, his confidence had *diminiſhed*. He agreed to limit the amendment to ſtriking out the word *undiminiſhed*, in the clauſe above quoted.

Mr. SEDGWICK *(Maſſachuſetts)* obſerved, that it had now, in conſequence of the motion for ſtriking out the word *undiminiſhed*, become a queſtion of fact, whether our own and our conſtituents' confidence in the Preſident was, or was not, diminiſhed? To ſuppoſe the former, in his opinion, was unſupported by facts, was diſgraceful to our conſtituents, and muſt, in the end, prove baneful to that ſyſtem of government which we were attempting to adminiſter.

That, ſo far as he was acquainted with the actual diſpoſition of the people of that part of the country where alone he could have obtained competent knowledge, he was as certain as he could be of any public ſentiments, that confidence in the Preſident, ſo far from being diminiſhed by the artifices which had been made uſe of on the contrary, had been increaſed; and he felt perfectly ſure, that at no antecedent pe-

riod had the tide of popular affection ſet ſo ſtrongly towards him as at the preſent moment.

That this part of the addreſs expreſſed our own and our conſtituents' undiminiſhed confidence in the Preſident, and an acknowledgment of his zealous and ſucceſsful labours in the public ſervice. That he had approved of this part of the addreſs, as a member of the ſelect Committee; and on reviewing, ſince, the ſubject, he had found no cauſe to reject the opinion which he had then formed. He did believe, and he loved to believe, becauſe it was honourable to his conſtituents, that the late efforts which had been made, had, inſtead of diminiſhing, increaſed the public confidence. That a late meaſure of the Executive had indeed provided a fit occaſion for a diſcloſure of enmities which prudence and policy had heretofore concealed, *but* had not ſhaken the well-founded reliance of the public on the wiſdom and integrity of the Preſident. To ſuppoſe an abatement of confidence, in his opinion, was to ſuppoſe in the people a want of a due ſenſe of gratitude for the diſtinguiſhed bleſſings which they enjoyed; it was to ſuppoſe a baſeneſs of diſpoſition unworthy of their former conduct, unworthy of freemen. "Who," he aſked, "of a candid mind, and fair and honourable ſentiments, can take a review of the glorious conduct of our Chief during the conflict of the revolution; his zealous and ſucceſsful labours for the public good; his bravery, moderation, and humanity: who can follow him to the place of his happy retirement, and there again behold him covered with glory, attended by the gratitude and affection of his fellow-citizens, and the applauſes of the world; who can ſee him again iſſuing, at the call of his countrymen, from this retirement, and putting at hazard, for their benefit, the mighty maſs of reputation which he had collected, that beſt reward of virtuous minds; who can review the

the ſituation of this country for the ſix years of his adminiſtration, the dangers to which we have been expoſed, and the happy eſcapes we have experienced, effected by his prudence, ſagacity, and firmneſs; who can review the conduct of the Preſident in theſe intereſting ſcenes but with a heart filled with gratitude, affection, and confidence?"

No man, he hoped, in his heart; no man, he believed, would, conſiſtently with a due regard to his own reputation, deny to the Preſident his juſt claims of merit. No man could, without diſgracing his conſtituents, deny their participation in this ſentiment. It only remained then to be inquired, whether theſe juſt feelings of their and our hearts ought, under the exiſting circumſtances, to be publiſhed to the world. He held this declaration to be, at this moment, an indiſpenſable obligation due from the repreſentatives of the people, from a regard to themſelves, their conſtituents, and the permanent and beneficial exiſtence of the Government which they had choſen.

Although the Preſident had twice been called by the unanimous and unſolicited voice of his countrymen, to preſide in their Government; though, to comply with their wiſhes, he had ſacrificed more than any other man could have done; and although the only reward he ſought, or would accept, was their approbation, yet licentious and turbulent preſſes had teemed with ſcandalous and infamous abuſe. What ſentiments by theſe cauſes might be produced in his mind, whether pity, contempt, or indignation, or a mixture of them all, he could not determine; nor was it neceſſary to inquire further, to determine whether we ſhould attempt to defeat their effects. In no manner could this be done ſo effectually as by declaring our own and our conſtituents' confidence in him.

The Preſident had told the Legiſlature that it was the favourite wiſh of his heart to unite with us in our efforts to preſerve, prolong, and improve our immenſe advantages. Did we believe this declaration? Why then ſhould we not unite in counteracting the malignant efforts of ſedition, by publiſhing the ſentiment, at once juſt to him, and honourable to ourſelves?

The efforts which had been made to depreciate the character of that firſt of men and of patriots, inſtead of producing the nefarious effect, he believed in his conſcience had increaſed, as it ought, the public confidence and regard. Thus feeling and believing, he wiſhed to reſcue our country from the imputation of baſeneſs and ingratitude, which otherwiſe it would appear to merit.

But it was ſaid that an expreſſion of confidence at this time, might be conſtrued into a declaration of approbation of a late meaſure of the Executive, and preclude the right of examining that meaſure according to its merit, whenever it ſhould be laid before the Legiſlature. To this he anſwered, that, for himſelf, he had no ſuch intention; and he believed it incapable of ſuch a conſtruction. Confidence did not imply an approbation of every part of the officer's conduct to whom it belonged; it did not exclude the idea of fallibility; but it only implied an approbation of the general tenour of his conduct.

If, when the firſt officer of our Government was thus attacked, he was left to be overwhelmed by a torrent of abuſe, without the countenance and ſupport of his conſtituents or their repreſentatives; what man, he aſked, who had talents to be uſeful, reputation to loſe, or feelings to be wounded, would put all at hazard to ſerve an ungrateful country? What would ſuch mean and baſe deſertion produce, but to make the firſt offices of our Government

poſts

poſts to which merit would be uncongenial? what but to provide vacancies to be filled by harpies who would prey on the vitals of the Republic?

There was another circumſtance which preſſed itſelf on his reflections on this occaſion. It was the character—the juſt character which the Preſident poſſeſſes throughout the civilized world. What would it be to reject this part of the addreſs, but to juſtify thoſe, he hoped unfounded, aſperſions which had been made on republican governments? what but to verify thoſe malign predictions which had been pointed at our ſyſtem?

Thus had he expoſed to the Committee, as conciſely as he could, his own views of this important ſubject. He would only add, that, when the Preſident entered firſt on the execution of the important duties of his office, the man who would have dared to predict that the preſent queſtion would, at this time, have become a ſubject of debate, would have been conſidered as predicting the infamy of his country.

Mr. LIVINGSTON ſaid there were many whoſe confidence was impaired by a late tranſaction. He could not therefore conſent to the expreſſion in the draft of the addreſs. Mr. Sedgwick had ſaid that conſenting to ſtrike out the word *undiminiſhed*, would be telling the world that our confidence actually is diminiſhed; and the Member from Maſſachuſetts adds, that the Houſe are now brought into a diſtreſſing dilemma. If there is a diſtreſs in the caſe, it originates with this Member himſelf, as one of the Committee who brought in this draft of an addreſs. He moved, to prevent any unconciliating debates, that the addreſs might be recommitted. The motion was ſeconded by Mr. Sedgwick. The Committee roſe, and the reſolution for recommitting paſſed.

It was then moved that two members ſhould be

added to the Committee on drafting the addreſs. Mr. Tracy conſidered the preſent number as ſufficient. Mr. Freeman and Mr. Baldwin were added.

WEDNESDAY, 16*th December*, 1795.

The ſelect Committee reported the following addreſs to the Preſident, in anſwer to his ſpeech to both Houſes of Congreſs, which was unanimouſly agreed to:

To the Preſident of the United States.

SIR,

As the Repreſentatives of the people of the United States, we cannot but participate with the ſtrongeſt ſenſibility of every bleſſing which they enjoy, and cheerfully join with you in profound gratitude to the Author of all good, for the numerous and extraordinary bleſſings which he has conferred on our favoured country.

A final and formal termination of the diſtreſſing war which has ravaged our north-weſtern frontier, will be an event which muſt afford a ſatisfaction proportioned to the anxiety with which it has long been fought; and in the adjuſtment of the terms, we perceive the true policy of making them ſatisfactory to the Indians as well as to the United States, as the beſt baſis of a durable tranquillity. The diſpoſition of ſuch of the ſouthern tribes as had alſo heretofore annoyed our frontier, is another proſpect in our ſituation ſo important to the intereſt and happineſs of the United States, that it is much to be lamented, that any clouds ſhould be thrown over it, more eſpecially by exceſſes on the part of our own citizens.

While our population is advancing with a celerity which exceeds the moſt ſanguine calculations—while every part of the United States diſplays indications of rapid and various improvement—while we

are

are in the enjoyment of protection and ſecurity, by mild and wholeſome laws, adminiſtered by governments founded on the genuine principles of rational liberty, a ſecure foundation will be laid for accelerating, maturing, and eſtabliſhing the proſperity of our country; if, by treaty and amicable negotiation, all thoſe cauſes of external diſcord, which heretofore menaced our tranquillity, ſhall be extinguiſhed, on terms compatible with our national rights and honour, and with our conſtitution and great commercial intereſts.

Among the various circumſtances in our internal ſituation, none can be viewed with more ſatisfaction and exultation than that the late ſcene of diſorder and inſurrection has been completely reſtored to the enjoyment of order and repoſe. Such a triumph of reaſon and of law is worthy of the free Government under which it happened, and was juſtly to be hoped from the enlightened and patriotic ſpirit which pervades and actuates the people of the United States.

In contemplating that ſpectacle of national happineſs which our country exhibits, and of which you, Sir, have been pleaſed to make an intereſting ſummary, permit us to acknowledge and declare the very great ſhare which your zealous and faithful ſervices have contributed to it, and to expreſs the affectionate attachment which we feel for your character.

The ſeveral intereſting ſubjects which you recommend to our conſideration, will receive every degree of attention which is due to them: and whilſt we feel the obligation of temperance and mutual indulgence in all our diſcuſſions, we truſt and pray, that the reſult to the happineſs and welfare of our country may correſpond with the pure affection we bear to it.

THURSDAY, 17*th December*, 1795.

The Speaker, attended by the Houſe, waited on the Preſident with the addreſs, to which they received the following reply:

GENTLEMEN,

Coming, as you do, from all parts of the United States, I receive great ſatisfaction from the concurrence of your teſtimony in the juſtneſs of the intereſting ſummary of our national happineſs, which, as the reſult of my inquiries, I preſented to your view. The ſentiments we have mutually expreſſed of profound gratitude to the Source of thoſe numerous bleſſings, the Author of all good, are pledges of our obligations to unite our ſincere and zealous endeavours, as the inſtruments of Divine Providence, to preſerve and perpetuate them.

Accept, Gentlemen, my thanks for your declaration, that to my agency you aſcribe the enjoyment of a great ſhare of theſe benefits. So far as my ſervices contribute to the happineſs of my country, the acknowledgment thereof, by my fellow-citizens, and their affectionate attachment, will ever prove an abundant reward.

REMARKS.—Thus ended this part of the proceedings in a manner which, perhaps, reflects but little honour on the Houſe of Repreſentatives.

The ſentiment contained in the propoſed addreſs, expreſſing an *undiminiſhed* confidence in the Preſident, ſeemed the moſt proper that any combination of words could convey; and particularly on the preſent occaſion. The meaſures of the Chief Magiſtrate had been moſt violently oppoſed; he had been all but menaced, in order to deter him from the exerciſe of powers veſted in him by the Conſtitution; his motives had been diſfigured, and his character reviled.

reviled. This was to be expected from the leaders of a faction averſe to his adminiſtration, and even to the Government, and from thoſe among the people whom they had been able to miſlead. But, were the declarations of theſe turbulent demagogues; were the licentious aſperſions and abominable falſehoods of that *hired* tribe, to be ſeconded by the Legiſlators of the Union? On this addreſs the malcontents had fixed their eyes: from it they expected encouragement or reproof. To be ſilent was to encourage. The Repreſentatives knew that the feelings of the Preſident had been deeply wounded, and it was their place to adminiſter the healing balm. To this effect, and at once to ſilence the hydra of faction, nothing was ſo well calculated as a firm and explicit declaration, that their confidence was *undiminiſhed*.

However, had not the word *undiminiſhed* been introduced into the propoſed addreſs, the omiſſion of that epithet would have been of leſs conſequence; but, when once propoſed to expunge it by a vote of the Houſe, was to declare to the whole Union, and even to the whole world, that the Preſident had *loſt the confidence of his fellow-citizens*; a declaration that, in ſome countries, precedes a diſmiſſion from office, downfal, and diſgrace!

Mr. PARKER, who made the motion for ſtriking out the word *undiminiſhed*, tells us plainly that, "with much *reſpect* for the Preſident, his *confidence* was *diminiſhed*;" and thus, in this ſhort ſentence, advances the moſt palpable inconſiſtency that ever fell from the lips of mortal man. His confidence diminiſhes, while his reſpect remains undiminiſhed! Unleſs, indeed, we are to imagine that his reſpect was in a conſumption as well as his confidence. Such a paradoxical avowal might ſhine in the lunatic reveries of a Rouſſeau; but is little congenial with the ſobriety of a legiſlative debate.

Theſe obſervations are far from being inapplicable to the addreſs finally agreed on by the Houſe. On the 16th of December they "acknowledge and de- "clare, that the *zealous* and *faithful ſervices* of the "Preſident have had a very great ſhare in contribut- "ing to the happineſs of the country; and expreſs the "*affectionate attachment* they feel for his character," when, but the very day before, they had determined that their confidence in him was diminiſhed! If they were perſuaded that his zeal and faithful ſervices had ſo eminently contributed to the happineſs of the country, what reaſon had they to declare that their confidence was diminiſhed? And, if their confidence was diminiſhed, how could his character deſerve their affectionate attachment? There is no medium here: confidence in a public man is like virtue in a woman; as long as it exiſts at all it muſt be unimpaired. It is entire, or it is no more.

There is no telling what may be the effect of theſe proceedings; but certain it is, it will not be the fault of Mr. Parker and thoſe who ſided with him on this occaſion, if General Waſhington, or any other man who has a reputation to loſe, ſhould again be ſeen at the head of Government*. The three branches ſhould be checks on each other, it is true; but if they are not alſo mutual ſupports, the whole fabric will ſoon crumble to the ground; and the degree of popular ſtrength, whatever that may be, acquired by the repreſentative branch through the preſent deciſion, muſt inevitably tend to enfeeble the other two.

---

* This grudging vote was one of the cauſes which induced Waſhington to *retire* in the ſpring of 1797. He never before had experienced any thing like diſapprobation. He now ſaw that his power to command univerſal applauſe was gone, never to return; and he accordingly reſolved to quit his ſtation.

Debate

Debate on the Attempt at Corruption, by Randall and Whitney.

MONDAY, *December 28th*, 1795.

Mr. SMITH (S. C.) requeſted the attention of the Houſe for a moment, to a ſubject of a very delicate nature. He underſtood that a memorial was this morning to be preſented from ſome individuals, applying for a grant of a large tract of the Weſtern Territory: and as the Houſe had referred all ſuch applicants to the Committee for bringing in the Land Office Bill, of which he was Chairman; and as it was probable that the memorial about to be preſented would be diſpoſed of in the ſame manner, he conceived it a duty incumbent on him to diſcloſe to the Houſe, at this time, ſome circumſtances which had come to his knowledge. Mr. Smith then ſaid, that on Tueſday evening laſt, a perſon of the name of Randall called on him, requeſting an hour of confidential converſation. In the interview which took place, Randall made a communication to the following effect. He intended to preſent a memorial on the Monday following to Congreſs for a grant of all the Weſtern lands lying between lakes Michigan, Erie, and Huron, to the amount of about twenty millions of acres. He and his aſſociates, ſome of whom were Canada merchants, who had great influence over the Indians, propoſed to form a company, and to undertake the extinction of the Indian title, provided Congreſs would cede to them the fee ſimple of the land. The property would be divided into forty ſhares, twenty-four of which ſhould be reſerved for ſuch members of Congreſs as might *favour* the ſcheme, and might be inclined to come into it, after the adjournment of Congreſs, on the ſame terms as the original aſſociators. Randall himſelf had the diſpoſal of twelve ſhares, for

for members from the Southern States; and colleagues of his, a like number of thoſe of the Eaſtern States. A certain number of ſhares were to be the property of thoſe Canada merchants, who had an unbounded influence over the Indians occupying thoſe lands, and who would, if this plan ſucceeded, pacify thoſe Indians who were the moſt hoſtile to the United States: that General Wayne's treaty was a mere deluſion, and that without the co-operation of thoſe influential perſons the United States would never have peace in that quarter. Mr. Smith ſaid, that he had communicated this overture the next morning to Mr. Murray, one of the members from Maryland, requeſting his advice how to proceed on ſo delicate an occaſion; that Mr. Murray recommended a diſcloſure to Mr. Henry of the Senate, and that, on a conſultation with thoſe gentlemen, it was reſolved that it was Mr. Smith's duty to make an immediate communication of the matter to the Preſident, which was accordingly done.

Mr. MURRAY roſe next. He had received an application of the ſame nature; but having already heard of the propoſal, "I was," ſaid Mr. Murray, "in a ſtate of preparation, and my virtue had not "ſuch a ſhock to encounter as that of the Gentleman "laſt up."

Mr. Murray corroborated what Mr. Smith had ſaid as to the communication of this affair to himſelf. He adviſed Mr. Smith to give Randall another meeting, for the purpoſe of developing his ſcheme and expectations more fully.

Mr. MURRAY ſaid that Mr. Smith informed him on Wedneſday morning: next day, in the morning, he informed Mr. Henry of the Senate. Mr. Smith, on that day, informed the Preſident. On that day (Thurſday) Mr. Randall was introduced to him, and aſked an interview at his lodging; he gave him an appointment

appointment at five in the afternoon. Mr. Henry and he were together when Randall came in. Randall talked about the policy of extinguiſhing the Indian title to the peninſula formed by lakes Erie, Huron, and Michigan, containing about eighteen or twenty millions of acres of very good land; and talked in terms that he might have employed from a pulpit. He did not make any corrupt overtures till Mr. Murray had carried him into his own apartment. There Randall opened his propoſals, as had been before mentioned by Mr. Smith, obſerving, that if Congreſs would ſell this land to him and his company, they intended to divide it into forty or forty-one ſhares. Twenty-four ſhares were to be appropriated to ſuch members of Congreſs as choſe to ſupport the memorial, which would be preſented on Monday. The members were to have their ſhares on the ſame terms on which his company ſhould obtain the land. The company would give five hundred thouſand, or perhaps, a million of dollars; but on Mr. Murray's apparent acquieſcence in his views, he ſaid that the ſhares would be given to the members who advocated the meaſure, if they pleaſed to accept them, after they returned to their homes. Mr. Murray ſtarted a difficulty about the embarraſſment of land ſpeculations, for which he perſonally had no genius; and then Randall inſtantly turned out the cat, and told him, that if *he* did not chooſe the ſhare of land, he ſhould have caſh in hand for his ſhare. Mr. Smith and Mr. Murray had reſolved to diſcloſe this to the Houſe, leſt ſome innocent member might offer a memorial, and become liable to ſuſpicion. Randall had hinted that larger proportions would be aſſigned to the more active members, and leſſer ones for *the ſmall fiſh*.

The Speaker then roſe, and expreſſed a wiſh that ſome Gentleman would move for an order to apprehend

hend Randall. Upon this, Mr. Smith again roſe, and ſaid, that a warrant to this effect had yeſterday been iſſued by the Preſident, and to ſupport which, Mr. Smith had made oath before a magiſtrate to the particulars above mentioned. He hoped that by this time the perſon was taken.

Mr. GILES roſe next, and obſerved that an application from the ſame Mr. Randall had been made to himſelf. Beſides a repetition of ſome particulars already ſtated, he told Mr. GILES that he had already ſecured thirty or forty members of this Houſe, but he wanted to ſecure three other members, if Mr. Giles recollected right. He added, that he had already ſecured a majority in the Senate. When this propoſal was firſt made, which he thought was about ten days ago, a member from New-York (Mr. Livingſton) was preſent. Randall had even gone ſo far as to ſay, that a written agreement was drawn out, and ſubſcribed by a number of eaſtern members, and he wiſhed Mr. Giles to extend another obligation of the ſame kind for the ſouthern members; the purport of which paper was underſtood to be, that the members who voted in ſupport of the diſpoſal of the lands, were to be ſecured in a ſtipulated ſhare of them, without having their names mentioned in the deed. Mr. Giles was ſolicitous to learn the names of the members who had *already* entered into the negotiation; but Randall aſſured him, that, from motives of delicacy, he durſt not communicate any of the names. Mr. Giles then deſired a ſight of the agreement, that he might be able to comprehend its meaning, before he ſhould attempt to draw any ſimilar paper. The man called a ſecond time, and, as Mr. Giles conceived, about four days ago, but never could produce either the deed, or any draught of it. Mr. Giles had already communicated the propoſal to ſeveral members, and, in particular, to the Speaker.

The Speaker (Mr. Dayton) mentioned, that Mr. Giles had, ſome time ago, informed him of the propoſal. He replied, that, if an opportunity offered, *he would take care to ſelect a Committee conſiſting of members ſure to detect the guilty*, if any ſuch could exiſt; adding, that he expected the Houſe to believe that he would not have uſed ſuch words, but on ſo extraordinary an occaſion.

Mr. CHRISTIE ſaid, that he was the perſon who introduced Randall to Mr. Smith and Mr. Murray. He had long known him as a reſpectable man. He had mentioned to Mr. Chriſtie, in general, that it was a landed ſpeculation; and hinted that he, Mr. Chriſtie, might accept of a ſhare. In reply, that Gentleman aſſured him that he could not poſſibly have a concern in any ſuch tranſaction. Randall had not, to Mr. Chriſtie, inſinuated that any undue advantages would accrue to members ſupporting the intended purchaſe.

Mr. BUCK, a member from Vermont, mentioned that a perſon of the name of Whitney, who appears to have been an aſſociate of Randall, had called upon him in the country, with a propoſal of this kind.

REMARKS.—I never was more ſurpriſed in my life, than when I heard Mr. Dayton, the Speaker, avow, that he had told Mr. Giles he would *take care to ſelect ſuch a Committee* as ſhould detect the *guilty*, if any ſuch could exiſt.

This ſentence from the Speaker diſcovers to us, that he had but an indifferent opinion of the integrity of ſome of the members of the Houſe: for, had not this been the caſe, he would not have fallen on a plan of *detecting* the *guilty*. The *qualifying phraſe*, "if any ſuch could exiſt," does by no means do away the exiſtence of ſuſpicion in his mind; for, if no ſuſpicion exiſted, why ſhould he talk of *taking care to ſelect a Committee* for the purpoſe of detection?

tection? This laſt expreſſion has alſo ſomething of a party nature in it. Mr. Dayton ſhould have preſumed that *every member* in the Houſe would be anxious to detect guilt: to ſay that he would take care *to ſelect* ſuch a Committee as would do this, was not only to preſume that there were ſome members who would *not do it*, but it was to hint, at the ſame time, that he knew, or at leaſt gueſſed, *who thoſe members were*. This concluſion is inevitable; for it would have been an abſurdity which ſo ſenſible a man as the Speaker could not have fallen into, to propoſe to himſelf the ſelecting of ſuch a Committee as would be *ſure* to detect the guilty, if he had had an equal confidence in all the members of the Houſe, or if he had not ſome particular members in his eye, whom he looked upon as men of more integrity than ſome others. I know not how the Houſe felt on this occaſion; but had I been a member, I freely declare, that I ſhould have felt my honour much more deeply wounded by this ſuggeſtion of the Speaker, than by any thing that poſſibly could be advanced, or even proved, by the land-jobbers themſelves. If he had incautiouſly let fall ſuch expreſſions to Mr. Giles, there was certainly no kind of neceſſity for repeating them in public, unleſs called upon to that effect. This is by no means the leaſt exceptionable circumſtance, as the unaſked-for repetition of the ſuggeſtion ſeems to have been merely a lure for popularity; a trick always beneath an independent member of Congreſs, and more eſpecially ſo, when that popularity is to be obtained at the expenſe of his colleagues.

TUESDAY, *December 29th.*

Mr. BLOUNT brought forward a reſolution in nearly the following words: "Reſolved, that it be "made a charge againſt Robert Randall, that he "declared to a Member of this Houſe, that a num-

"ber,

" ber, conſiſting of not leſs than thirty members of " this Houſe, had engaged to ſupport his memo- " rial."

Mr. MURRAY called upon Gentlemen, by their *ſenſibility to perſonal dignity*, and the character of the Houſe, to arreſt the motion. Its tendency certainly was *to place the honour of the Houſe*, or a very great part of it, *in the power of a man, of whoſe known profligacy of principles there could now be no doubt.* Will you, he obſerved, permit, nay invite, him whom you arraign at the bar of this Houſe, to be a *public accuſer?* Will you adopt a charge againſt him, which is in its nature an imputation, that, however lightly and wickedly made, will implicate perhaps innocent men? Theſe men, to reſcue their own reputations, will be obliged to riſk their characters, on the weight of their veracity, by denying this man's charge in the face of a world but too prone to ſuſpect.—By this motion Randall's aſſertion to the Gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Giles), the only member who has mentioned it, is to be alleged againſt Randall as an offence. That Randall ſaid to the Gentleman that there were thirty or forty members *ſecured*, he had no doubt—but the believed the fact to be, that Randall was both deceived himſelf, and attempted to deceive the Gentleman—" Why," ſaid Mr. Murray, " the " fellow told me that there were thirty members ſe- " cured."—Mr. Murray had not thought proper to ſtate that circumſtance, becauſe he did not ſo much conſider it as a fact material to the detection of Randall's guilt, as it was one, which, if mentioned, might poſſibly afford to malice an opportunity of affixing a ſtigma to any thirty or forty names at which perſonal enmity might point. No public good could reſult from ſuch a diſcloſure—for the aſſertion of ſuch a man as Randall could not, among men of honour, be deemed a ſufficient ground of ſuſpicion; and yet the malice of the world, or the rancour of perſonal ene-

mies, might attach ſuſpicion and diſhonour to almoſt the whole Houſe, from the indefiniteneſs of the charge. When Randall informed him on Thurſday night that there were thirty members who would ſupport his meaſures, he had felt in the very conduct which he was then himſelf purſuing to detect Randall, to arreſt his ſcheme, a principle of candour towards others, which taught him that other gentlemen, to whom Randall had communicated his ſcheme *confidentially*, were probably determined, as honeſtly as himſelf, to cruſh the infamous plot againſt the honour of the Houſe. He knew that he who would be wicked enough to attempt ſeduction, might be weak enough to uſe this intelligence artfully, for the purpoſe of leading him the more readily to accept terms of infamy; becauſe the object was painted as eaſily attainable; and that Randall might wiſh to diminiſh all qualms, by exhibiting a pretended group of accomplices, whoſe company would, at leaſt, diminiſh the appearance of ſingularity. I entertained, ſaid Mr. Murray, no ſuſpicion of any man—I knew Randall to be a corrupt man, from his offers to myſelf—I therefore placed all his intelligence to the ſcore of flimſy art I knew that ſuch a man was not to be fully believed where his intereſt was to magniſy his ſucceſs—I drew favourable auſpices with reſpect to the corps to which I belong, from another piece of intelligence of his, which was, that he communicated to ſome members, one of whom he had named, and whom I knew to be a man of honour, in what he called the *general* way.—This general way was a diſplay of the ſounder part of his ſcheme merely, and not the corrupt: conſiſting in developing the advantages which would reſult to the Union in the diſpoſal of their lands, provided the harmony of the Indians could be ſecured. In this view of his plan he gave the ſubject an attitude far from unimpoſing; and I conceived, that as, in proportion

portion to the numbers engaged confidentially, he muſt know that the hazard of detection increaſed, he would not communicate the corrupt view as long as he found the more honeſt part of the policy might appear to ſtrike any gentleman as a meaſure uſeful to his country—I therefore *did not believe* Randall in the ſenſe he evidently intended. Therefore, Sir, I did not feel myſelf at liberty to mention the aſſertion, which I conceived to be unavailing as a circumſtance neceſſary to the example I wiſhed to make, but which, if communicated, I thought might caſt a ſtain, by the myſtery that enveloped it, upon a body whoſe character ought to be held ſacred to the confidence of the country. My duty was to bring Randall's attempt to corrupt unequivocally into light; not by repeating all the arts which he uſed in order to corrupt; not by exhibiting them in a way that might wound the feelings of men of honour, who, if charged even perſonally by Randall, would have no refuge from odium, but in their characters and counter-aſſertion. This, though always concluſive with thoſe who perſonally know them, is not a protection to minds of ſenſibility againſt the ſtings of calumny. The voice of fame is not compoſed from the voice of men of honour.

It was, he ſaid, in the ſpirit of ſuch reflections, that he and the Gentleman with whom he had concerted the mode and time of diſcloſure (Mr. W. Smith) had determined to truſt rather to the as yet unſtained honour of the Houſe, than to the looſe declarations of Randall, and therefore had reſolved on Friday morning to make the diſcloſure before ſome Gentleman, innocent of the corrupt ſcheme, and acquainted with the ſounder part of the plan only, might have cauſe to bluſh at having preſented a memorial which it would be their duty to defeat and cover with infamy. If this charge is exhibited

againſt Randall, he will confeſs or deny it; if he confeſſes it, and, in the diſpoſition that often accompanies detected guilt, ſhould name particular gentlemen, though their counter-aſſertion would completely, in his own mind, outweigh the charge of a corrupt and profligate accuſer, like Randall, yet would every man of delicacy have cauſe to regret, that, merely for the purpoſe of adding to the charges againſt a man proved to be wicked, a ſtain had glanced from him upon a name innocent and honourable. Let gentlemen act with magnanimity upon this occaſion—Let them reſiſt a motion, which, however purely conceived, may eventually wound honeſt fame, without detecting guilt. Mr. Murray ſolemnly believed, that Randall's aſſertion was either falſe totally, or true only as it reſpected thoſe who had liſtened to him for the purpoſe of making an example—or thoſe to whom he had ſpoken in what he had called the *general* way. If Randall denied this charge, it would reſt on the aſſertion of the Gentleman from Virginia, but could not affect members farther, than as the meaſure of inquiry ſeemed to imply ſuſpicion. He and the Gentleman from South Carolina had both acted upon the preſumption of innocence in members, and they had reſolved on the timely diſcloſure yeſterday, leſt even one member, however innocent, might be placed in a painful ſituation by preſenting the memorial. If Randall is charged with this as an offence, he verily believed the Houſe betrayed its own honour to the malice of the world. He would therefore vote decidedly againſt it.

Mr. Murray, in the courſe of his ſpeech, added ſeveral other obſervations. He did not doubt that in every diſtrict of the continent, thirty *favourites* would be pointed out, whom the people in that quarter,

quarter, or at leaſt ſome among them, would be diſpoſed to conſign to infamy; and perhaps there was not one diſtrict in the Union where the ſame thirty members would be named. It would be ſaid, "Sir, they are not named, but *I know who are the* "*men.*" So rapid were the communications of the preſs, ſo keen the appetite for ſcandal, that, when once the ſtory was circulated, it might be impoſſible ever to get rid of it.

Mr. GILES replied: He was in favour of the motion of Mr. Blount. He ſaid it was evident from the way in which this whole communication had been brought forward, that there had been no previous correſpondence between Mr. Murray and himſelf. They had felt differently. Mr. Giles had informed the Speaker of the Houſe. Mr. Murray and his friend (Mr. W. Smith) had communicated the affair to the Preſident; a meaſure of which, as it ſtruck Mr. Giles, he did not diſtinctly perceive the propriety. Mr. Giles had conſidered it as beſt to wait in ſilence till the petition of Randall ſhould come forward. Mr. Murray had ſuggeſted a variety of delicate motives for breaking the matter to the Houſe, leſt the petition ſhould come forward and hurt the feelings of an innocent and unſuſpecting Member. Mr. Giles did not wiſh to diminiſh the credit fully due to the Gentleman in this reſpect. He himſelf had felt ſomewhat differently. He had acted differently.

Mr. HILLHOUSE was convinced that there was not a Gentleman in the Houſe whoſe character reſted on ſo ſlender a foundation as to be affected by any thing this man could ſay. He felt no anxiety for the reputation of the Houſe, for he knew that it was not in the ſmalleſt danger. The reſolution went merely to make Randall confeſs that he had ſaid ſo and ſo. It implied nothing tending to affect

members. A man covered with infamy making ſuch charges could not expect credit, or obtain it from any body. Mr. Hillhouſe was, for theſe reaſons, in favour of the reſolution for interrogating Randall.

The reſolution paſſed in the affirmative.

WEDNESDAY, *30th December*, 1795.

RANDALL and WHITNEY being in cuſtody, a debate took place with reſpect to allowing them counſel at the bar of the Houſe, which was alſo determined in the affirmative. On this occaſion *Mr. Chriſtie* obſerved, that he had known Randall *for many years*, and had never heard of any thing againſt him before. He had lately been at Detroit, and Mr. Chriſtie believed that he had been injured by keeping *bad company*. He was not the firſt man in the country who had been *corrupted* by *Britiſh influence* and *Britiſh company*. He moved that Randall ſhould be allowed until to-morrow at twelve o'clock. This was negatived.

REMARKS.—It appeared to me particularly cruel to negative this motion of Mr. Chriſtie's, ſeeing that poor Randall, whom *Mr. Chriſtie had known for ſo many years*, had been injured by keeping *bad company*. But, as to *Britiſh influence*, I could not for my life perceive with what propriety it was brought in here. It ſeemed rather a wanton attack on the character of a nation, whoſe influence in the line of corruption has not been made apparent in this country; and I may add, it was a wanton attack on the people of this country too, to ſay that Randall "was *not the firſt* man in it who had been *corrupted* by Britiſh influence." Mr. Chriſtie ſeems, indeed, to have fallen into the cant of the oppoſers of the treaty; for we know that they attributed its concluſion and ratification to the influence of Britiſh gold. We have

have ſeen the firm, candid, and upright man, who negotiated that treaty, and the ſenators who adviſed its ratification, burnt in an effigy, repreſenting them as receiving the gold of Great Britain; we have been long ſcandalized at theſe ſcenes, and at the atrocious falſehood of the opinion they were intended to propagate; one would have hoped therefore, that no Member of Congreſs would have ſanctioned, in any manner, however indirect, proceedings from which every well-informed and honeſt man turns with indignation.

As to the innocence of the land-jobbers, it would be wrong to ſay any thing poſitive about it after the deciſion of the Houſe; but it was not to be wondered at if *men of that profeſſion* ſhould imagine it poſſible to bribe the members of Congreſs after what they had heard of other people in the Government. After having heard of the "precious confeſſions" and "overtures" of Mr. Randolph, on behalf of himſelf and others, one would not have been ſurpriſed if they had attempted to bribe the Preſident himſelf. They found, however, *other ſort of men to deal with**.

On the Reception of the French Flag.

TUESDAY, *January 5th*, 1796.

I was rather late in my attendance in Congreſs this day; a circumſtance the more diſtreſſing, as I found not only the gallery, but even the paſſage alſo, full of ſpectators. I, at laſt, made ſhift to reach my poſt; but not without an infinite deal of difficulty; for the citizens I had to deal with, being in general brimful of the doctrine of equality, pay but very little reſpect to old age.

* Men of a higher price!

Every perſon within the walls of this Houſe ſeemed to be waiting for the developement of ſome great and important myſtery. The members were paired off, laying their heads together, whiſpering and liſtening with great eagerneſs; while the Speaker, ſeated with his chin ſupported between his right finger and thumb, and his eyes rivetted to the floor, appeared loſt, buried alive, as it were, in profundity of thought. Never did wiſdom appear more lovely in my eyes. "Two ſuch ſtatues," ſaid I to myſelf, "would have become the ſhrine of *Minerva* "much better than the blinking twilight mouſers, "that her votaries formerly placed on it.'

This ſerioufneſs of the members of the Houſe naturally produced the moſt anxious expectation in the minds of the good citizens in my quarter. A thouſand ridiculous inquiries were made in the twinkling of an eye, which were anſwered by a thouſand ſtill more ridiculous conjectures. One ſaid that a law was going to be read to oblige the Virginians to free their ſlaves and pay their juſt debts; but another ſwore that was impoſſible. A third declared a ſecond embargo was to be laid; and a fourth obſerved that it was to hinder the cruel Engliſh from carrying off our poor horſes, to eat them in the Weſt Indies. In ſhort, were I to repeat all that I heard, I ſhould never have done; for, of two hundred of us, no two individuals were of the ſame opinion. One thing, however, we all agreed in, an impatience that I ſhould in vain endeavour to deſcribe, but of which the half-ſucceſsful lover, who has waited for an anſwer to a ſupplicating billet-doux, may have ſome faint idea.

To tell the reader the truth of my opinion, I was afraid that ſome new confiſcating or ſequeſtrating project was on foot; and when Mr. Dayton, the Speaker, awoke from his reverie, and began to ſpeak, "Lord have mercy," ſaid I, "upon the poor "Britiſh

"British creditors." My fears on this account were soon dissipated. The Speaker told us that this message was of the most "*solemn*" and "*serious*" nature, and he therefore requested both the members of the House and the strangers in the gallery to observe the profoundest silence.

The reader will easily imagine, that a warning like this increased the torture of suspense. It was now that we felt the value of the hearing faculty. I observed my neighbours brushing aside their matted and untutored locks, that nothing might impede the entrance of the glad tidings. We were, as the poet says, "all eye, all ear." But there was a little man down below, whose anxiety seemed to surpass that of all the rest. He crept to within a very few paces of the leeward side of the chair, and, turning himself sideways, lifted up the left corner of his wig, placing the auricular orifice open and extended, in a direct line with the Speaker's mouth, so that not a single breath of the precious sounds could possibly escape him. His longing countenance seemed to say, in the language of his countryman Macbeth:— "Speak! speak! had I three ears, by Heaven I'd hear thee."

The attitude of this subaltern quidnunc had like to have shaken the inflexibility of my muscles; I made a shift, however, to mould them up into a gravity adapted to the awfulness of the scene that was preparing for my view. All at once, as if by the power of magic, the doors flew open, "grating on "their hinges harsh thunder," and the President's Secretary was introduced with an American officer bearing a flag, which I took to be a representation of the day of judgment. It had a *thunderbolt* in the centre, with a *cock* perched upon it; the emblems of Almighty vengeance and of watchfulness. At two of the corners the *globe* was represented in a flame. The staff was covered with black velvet, sad colour of

of death, and crowned with a Parifian pike, fatal inftrument, on which the bleeding and ghaftly heads, nay, even the palpitating hearts of men, women, and children, have fo often been prefented to the view of the polite and humane inhabitants of that capital.

Curiofity now gave way to another paffion, that of fear. For my part, I am not afhamed to confefs, that I never was in fuch trepidation fince I firft faw the light of day. Nor were my companions in a more enviable ftate. I looked round, and beheld the affrighted group huddled up together, like a brood of chickens waiting the mortal grip of the voracious kite. In this general picture of conftternation one object attracted particular notice. It was a democrat, who was fo fully perfuaded that the flag was the harbinger of fate, that he began to anticipate the torments of the world to come. Never did I before behold fuch dreadful fymptoms of a guilty confcience. He was as white as paper, his knees knocked together, his teeth chattered, he wrung his hands and rolled his eyes, but durft not lift them towards heaven. His voice was like the yell of the inhabitants of the infernal regions. "Oh! Franklin "Bache! Franklin Bache! Oh! that infernal athe-"iftical Calendar!" This was all we could get from him; but this was enough to affure me, that he was one of thofe unhappy wretches, who had been led aftray by the profligate correfpondents of Mr. Bache, and by the atheiftical decadery Calendar, which that gentleman has, with fo much unholy zeal, endeavoured to introduce amongft us, in place of the Chriftian one, we, as yet, make ufe of.

My attention was called off from this terrific picture of defpair by a voice from beneath. A tall fpare man, dreffed all in black from head to foot, who feemed to be "*A Calm Obferver*," was beginning, in a hollow voice, to read (as I expected) the de-

crees of fate, but to my agreeable ſurpriſe I found it was a decree of the National Convention : it was in the following words:

To the Repreſentatives of the United States of America in Congreſs aſſembled.

Citizens Repreſentatives,

The connexions which nature, reciprocal events, and a happy concurrence of circumſtances, have formed between two free nations, cannot but be indiſſoluble. You have ſtrengthened thoſe ſacred ties by the declarations which the Miniſter Plenipotentiary of the United States has made in your name to the National Convention, and to the French people. They have been received with rapture by a nation, who know how to appreciate every teſtimony which the United States have given to them of their affection. The colours of both nations, united in the centre of the National Convention, will be an everlaſting evidence of the part which the United States have taken in the ſucceſs of the French Republic.

You were the firſt defenders of the rights of man, in another hemiſphere. Strengthened by your example, and endowed with an invincible energy, the French people have vanquiſhed that tyranny, which during ſo many centuries of ignorance, ſuperſtition, and baſeneſs, had enchained a generous nation.

Soon did the people of the United States perceive, that every victory of ours ſtrengthened their independence and happineſs. They were deeply affected at our momentary misfortunes, occaſioned by treaſons purchaſed by Engliſh gold. They have celebrated with rapture the ſucceſſes of our brave armies.

None of theſe ſympathetic emotions have eſcaped the ſenſibility of the French nation. They have all ſerved to cement the moſt intimate and ſolid union that has ever exiſted between two nations.

The

The Citizen Adet, who will reſide near your Government in quality of Miniſter Plenipotentiary of the French Republic, is ſpecially inſtructed to tighten the bands of fraternity and mutual benevolence. We hope that he may fulfil this principal object of his miſſion, by a conduct worthy of the confidence of both nations, and of the reputation which his patriotiſm and virtues have acquired him.

An analogy of political principles; the natural relations of commerce and induſtry; the efforts and immenſe ſacrifices of both nations in defence of liberty and equality; the blood which they have ſpilled together; their avowed hatred for deſpots; the moderation of their political views; the diſintereſtedneſs of their councils; and eſpecially the ſucceſs of the vows which they have made in preſence of the Supreme Being, to be free or die, all combine to render indeſtructible the connexions which they have formed.

Doubt it not, Citizens; we ſhall finally deſtroy the combination of tyrants; you, by the picture of proſperity, which in your vaſt countries has ſucceeded to a bloody ſtruggle of eight years; we, by the enthuſiaſm which glows in the breaſt of every Frenchman. Aſtoniſhed nations, too long the dupes of perfidious kings, nobles, and prieſts, will eventually recover their rights, and the human race will owe to the American and French nations their regeneration and laſting peace.

PARIS, 30th Vendemiaire, 3d year of the French Republic, one and indiviſible.

The Members of the Committee of Public Safety,

J. S. B. DELMAS,

MERLIN [of Douai], &c.

"This *Merlin*," ſays Doctor Moore, in his Journal, "is not thought to be quite ſo great a conjurer "as his nameſake of old." The opinion here related

lated by the Doctor ſeems to be pretty well confirmed by the diſpatch before us; and I think we may add, that the reſt of the Committee of Public Safety, who participated in drawing it up, were no greater conjurers than their colleague.

Paſſing by the general ſtyle of this Anglo-Gallican epiſtle, let us examine a paſſage or two of its contents.

"The connexions which *nature*, *reciprocal events*, "and a happy concurrence of circumſtances, have "formed between two free nations, cannot but be "indiſſoluble."

By this we are to underſtand, that, in our *nature*, and in the *events of our revolution*, we reſemble the French. In the firſt place, what has nature given us in common with them? Are we deſcended from the ſame race? Is the reſemblance to be found in our perſons, in our language, or in our diſpoſitions? Did ever any body hear an American (except he was a frenchified democrat) running on with an eternal bombaſtical babble about nothing? Do we ſing, dance, and cut throats, all in the ſame inſtant? Place one of our plain, ſober, ſenſible young men by the ſide of a profligate prig of the revolution, and ſee if you can find any two animals of God's creation between which there is ſo little likeneſs. What, then, has nature done *to draw us together*, as they call it? It appears to me that ſhe has acted in a ſenſe directly oppoſite. Like a tender and ſolicitous mother, ſeeing her favourite children forming connexions contrary to her laws, ſhe has exerted all her efforts to *draw* them from their ruin. May we liſten to her voice! and not ſuffer ourſelves to be ſucked into the rattleſnake embraces of thoſe anarchiſts, whom ſhe ſays "avoid, as you would avoid my "curſe!"

As the nature of a people is a thing entirely independent of their own agency, I ſee no great reaſon that we have to be offended at the Convention for aſpiring

aſpiring to reſemble us in natural diſpoſitions and affection; but, with reſpect to *the events of our two revolutions*, the work of our own hands, to tell us that we are connected by a ſimilarity here, is what we may, and ought to be offended at, and highly too. Did we begin our revolution by murder? Was our declaration of independence, like their declaration of rights, promulgated amidſt the cries of the dying? Or did the heralds ſtand to read it under the dripping head of ſome innocent victim? Was our Congreſs ever divided into impious factions, ſtriving to outvie each other in cruelty and blaſphemy? Did they decree the word of God to be a lie, and write over our burial-places: "This is the place of *eternal ſleep?*" Did we ever ſee the guillotine permanent in our market-places; children bound beneath it, while the blood of their parents flowed on the ſcaffold; our gutters running with the ſtreams of life? Did we cut off the heads of our fathers and mothers, drag our children to death? And did theſe Repreſentatives of the French people ever hear that our Congreſs applauded ſuch helliſh acts? Did they ever hear, that we roaſted people alive, and cut off their fleſh to eat; that we ſtripped poor innocent defenceleſs women, and ſhot them by hundreds, with infants in their arms? Did they ever hear of men, born in America, or in any other country except France, ſavage enough to tear out the heart of a human being and bite it with their teeth; rip open women with child, and ſtick the quivering embryo on the point of their bayonets? Is there any American baſe enough to ſay that we were guilty of theſe things? And if we never were, in the name of all that's impudent, how durſt they thus inſult us by comparing the events of our revolution to thoſe of their own?—Never, till I heard this diſpatch read, did I wiſh for a ſeat among the Legiſlators of the Union. Had I been on that floor, this hectoring

epiſtle

epiſtle ſhould never have gone into the world, without being accompanied with a proof, that one American at leaſt felt as he ought to do the indignity offered to the character of his nation *.

But let us proceed to another paſſage.—" Soon " did the people of the United States perceive that " every victory of ours ſtrengthened their inde- " pendence and happineſs. They were deeply af- " fected at our momentary misfortunes, occaſioned " by treaſons purchaſed by Engliſh gold. They " have celebrated with rapture the ſucceſſes of our " brave armies."

Now, let me aſk who are thoſe people of the United States, that " *ſoon perceived*" that what Maſter Merlin pleaſes to call victories *ſtrengthened* their *independence* and *happineſs?* For my part, I was ſo far from perceiving this *ſoon*, that I have never perceived it at all; no, nor even imagined either. It would be but a poor pitiful independence, I am afraid, were it dependant on their victories. Their victories, if we ought to call victories what has been purchaſed by the ruin of an empire, have been in a quarter where we have neither territory nor commercial connexions. What is their overrunning the Low Countries to us? What ſafety can we poſſibly derive from their ſucceſs in Savoy, or their *late victory on the Rhine?* Had they ſallied out, indeed, and deſtroyed the great *Leviathan*, and eſtabliſhed for ever the liberty of the ſeas, as they faithfully promiſed us they would, I ſhould have liſtened to them; but, alas! the ſea-monſter ſtill rolls about,

* Leſt the reader ſhould imagine that the horrid deeds glanced at in this paragraph are advanced at random, I refer him to the *Bloody Buoy*. In this work the affrighted reader will ſee clear convincing *proofs* of ſuch conſummate villany, ſuch refinement in barbarity, as never before entered into the heart of the moſt ſavage butcher of the human ſpecies.

ſweeping

ſweeping them from the face of the waters, whenever he meets with them. This is fine ſtrengthening of our independence!

Beſides, there is ſomething in the very idea of an independence that ſtands in need of the ſtrength of another nation, which, to me, appears ridiculous. Independence ought to imply capacity to *ſtand alone*. If, then, we have this capacity, what need have we of French aid? And, if we have it not, we do wrong to talk about independence at all; for, a *dependant independence* is the moſt unenviable ſtate into which a poor helpleſs nation ever fell.—It is eaſy to diſcover why they are continually plying us with this old threadbare tale; but it is not ſo eaſy to diſcover how it happens that ſo many among us are ſtill their dupes.

We now come to the "Engliſh gold." They tell us, that the people of this country "were deep-"ly affected at their momentary misfortunes, occa-"ſioned by treaſons purchaſed by Engliſh gold." —This is an excellent way of accounting for misfortunes. When the French gain a victory, it is by their valour, but when they are beaten, it is by the gold of their enemies. There is one circumſtance here, which, it would ſeem, our dear friend Merlin overlooked; and that is, where there are treaſons there muſt be traitors, and where there is corruption there muſt be receivers as well as givers. This being the caſe, it naturally follows, that this Engliſh gold has been received by corrupt French traitors. Whether this does them honour or not, or whether it be a circumſtance that ought to excite our confidence in their nation, I leave the reader to determine.

But how does this apply to ourſelves?—What have we to do with their money matters?—Ah! perhaps the reader does not ſee why this Engliſh gold was ſlipped into the flag epiſtle. It was not without

without a motive, I can assure him. The writers knew that their epistle would be published in this country, and they looked upon it as a fine opportunity to hint at English corruption, when the treaty was about to arrive among us *. They knew also that they had made abundant use of gold themselves; and we have ever seen that it is the practice of the world to cry out on others, while the sin lies at their own door.

We have heard much talk about English gold, or, as it is commonly called, the "gold of Pitt;" but I would venture my life, that there is not a single person in the United States, who believes that it has been employed among us. A proof, an infallible proof, that it has not, we hear it exclaimed against. Gold has a different effect: it ever makes converts: it opens the mouth of the boisterous demagogue against every body else but the donor. Had Mr. Pitt known "the pretended patriots of "America," as well as Citizen Fauchet did; had he known that their consciences were going off dog-cheap, he might have employed a few thousand guineas to good purpose. He might have bought up all the *Democratic Societies* in the country at the reasonable rate of twenty pounds *per* club. These remarks may possibly reach Mr. Pitt; if they should, I hereby engage, if he will send me a bank bill of ten thousand pounds, to turn the hearts of all this horde of patriots in the course of one month from the date of my receipt. I will not only silence their execrations against him, but will turn their cerberean howlings into songs of praise. Instead of the bloody *Ca ira* and the brutal *Carmagnole*, I will make them bawl out, "Britannia rule the Waves;" nay, even "God save great George our King."

* This epistle was written in October, 1794; and consequently they expected it would arrive here before Mr. Jay.

And all this I undertake to do for the reaſonable commiſſion of twenty-five *per cent.* The reader may, perhaps, look upon this as preſumption in me; but when he recollects that I have to do with Democratic Societies; when he recollects that Citizen Fauchet could have "determined on *civil* war "or on *peace*," with the aid of only "a few thou-"ſand of dollars," he will be ready to allow, that I could perform what I here promiſe with ten thouſand good pounds ſterling.

In the next ſentence of the paſſage above quoted, Merlin tells us, that the people of America "cele-"brated with rapture the ſucceſſes of the brave "French armies."—Aye, aye, and of *the brave French fleets* too. I wiſh Maſter Merlin had ſpoken as little truth here as he has done in the reſt of his epiſtle. For my part, I have ever been aſhamed of theſe celebrations of the French ſucceſſes: they appeared to me to be indications of a ſpirit of partiality, very unbecoming in a people who were continually putting in their claims to the rights and privileges of *neutrality*. But let us do juſtice here. Who were theſe civic feaſters?—"The people of "America," ſays Merlin; but Merlin is a little miſtaken here. They were compoſed of the drunken rabble of ſome great towns, headed by thoſe who were very probably in the pay of the Convention. I am aware that I ſhall be told here, that the cannons of the State of Pennſylvania were fired at theſe feaſts, that the Governor aſſiſted in perſon, and that *honourable* mention is made of him, in the *procés-verbal* (or minutes of the proceedings) ſent to the French Government; but this will not make me retract what I have ſaid about *drunken rabble*, nor about thoſe who were very probably *in the pay* of the Convention; on the contrary, I produce this circumſtance as a proof of theſe my aſſertions.

I ſhall

I ſhall take particular notice of but one paſſage more of this loving legiſlative epiſtle.—"An ana- "logy of political principles; the natural relations of "commerce and induſtry; the efforts and immenſe "ſacrifices of both nations, in the defence of li- "berty and equality; the blood which they have "ſpilled together; their avowed hatred for deſ- "pots; the moderation of their political views; "the diſintereſtedneſs of their councils; and eſpe- "cially the ſucceſs *of the vows which they have made* "*in the preſence of the Supreme Being*, to be free, or "die,—all combine to render indeſtructible the "connexions which they have formed."

And do they tell us, that our vows to the Supreme Being reſemble theirs? And have they the aſſurance to talk to us about the Supreme Being, after the publication of their decrees? Do we not know, that one of this very Convention who writes to us thus, mounted the tribune of the Aſſembly, and called on them to "throw down the altars of "God?" And do we not know, that the Convention, in conſequence of this impious motion, decreed, that the French people acknowledged no other god, or rather goddeſs, but *Reaſon?* They not only inſtituted and celebrated a feſtival to this new-fangled deity, but a *ſtrumpet* was accoutred in the habiliments of *Reaſon*, ſeated on a throne of turf, ſurrounded with the inſignia of what ſhe was ſaid to repreſent, and in this guiſe received the adorations of the Convention, as well as of the people of Paris. Can we have forgotten theſe things? Can we have forgotten the decree that orders all religious books to be burnt, and can we have forgotten that this was really done? Who were the men, then, that did all this? The very Convention, that now talks to us about the Supreme Being.—But we are told that they have now abjured their errors; that they have now *decreed that there is a God.*—*Decreed* that there

is a God! What blaſphemy! As if it were as eaſy to overturn the throne of Heaven, as that of their own country! Is there any Chriſtian, is there any man, that can hear language like this without ſhuddering? Are theſe our principles?—No: we imitate them in nothing. And I hope in God we never ſhall.

I muſt now inſert the letter of the French Miniſter and that of the Preſident, which were communicated to the Houſe immediately after the diſpatch I have juſt been remarking on. But, firſt of all, it will be neceſſary to give the letter of the Preſident, by which the buſineſs was opened to the Congreſs.

Gentlemen of the Senate, and of the Houſe of Repreſentatives,

A letter from the Miniſter Plenipotentiary of the French Republic, received on the 22d of laſt month, covered an addreſs dated the 21ſt of October, 1794, from the Committee of Public Safety, to the Repreſentatives of the United States in Congreſs; and alſo informed me that he was inſtructed by the Committee to preſent to the United States the colours of France. I therefore propoſed to receive them laſt Friday, the firſt day of the new year, a day of general joy and congratulation. On that day the Miniſter of the French Republic delivered the colours, with an addreſs, to which I returned an anſwer. By the latter the Houſe will ſee that I have informed the Miniſter, that the colours will be depoſited with the archives of the United States. But it ſeemed to me proper previouſly to exhibit to the two Houſes of Congreſs theſe evidences of the continued friendſhip of the French Republic, together with the ſentiments expreſſed by me on the occaſion in behalf of the United States. They are herewith communicated.

G. WASHINGTON.

French

French Minister's Letter.

MR. PRESIDENT,

I come to acquit myself of a duty very dear to my heart.—I come to depoſit in your hands, and in the midſt of a people juſtly renowned for their courage and their love of liberty, the ſymbol of the triumphs and of the enfranchiſement of my nation.

When ſhe broke her chains;—when ſhe proclaimed the impreſcriptible rights of man;—when, in a terrible war, ſhe ſealed with her blood the covenant ſhe had made with Liberty,—her own happineſs was not alone the object of her glorious efforts;—her views extended alſo to all free people. She ſaw their intereſts blended with her own, and doubly rejoiced in her victories, which in aſſuring to her the enjoyment of her rights, became to them new *guarantees of their independence.*

Theſe ſentiments, which animated the French nation from the dawn of their revolution, have acquired new ſtrength ſince the foundation of the Republic. France, at that time, by the form of its government, aſſimilated to, or rather identified with, free people, ſaw in them only friends and brothers. Long accuſtomed to regard the American people as her moſt faithful allies, ſhe has ſought to draw cloſer the ties already formed in the fields of America, under the auſpices of victory, over the ruins of tyranny.

The National Convention, the organ of the will of the French nation, have more than once expreſſed their ſentiments to the American people;—but, above all, theſe burſt forth on that auguſt day, when the Miniſter of the United States preſented to the National Repreſentation the colours of his country. Deſiring never to loſe recollections as dear to Frenchmen as they muſt be to Americans, the

Convention ordered that theſe colours ſhould be placed in the hall of their ſittings. They had experienced ſenſations too agreeable not to cauſe them to be partaken of by their allies, and decreed that to them the National colours ſhould be preſented.

Mr. Preſident, I do not doubt their expectations will be fulfilled; and I am convinced that every citizen will receive with a pleaſing emotion, this flag, elſewhere the terror of the enemies of liberty, here the certain pledge of faithful friendſhip; eſpecially when they recollect that it guides to combat, men who have *ſhared their toils*, and who were prepared for liberty by *aiding them to acquire their own*.

(Signed) P. A. Adet.

Preſident's Anſwer.

Born, Sir, *in a land of liberty*; having early learned its value; having engaged in a perilous conflict *to defend* it; having, in a word, devoted the beſt years of my life to ſecure its permanent eſtabliſhment in my own country; my anxious recollections, my ſympathetic feelings, and my beſt wiſhes are irreſiſtibly excited, whenſoever in any country I ſee an oppreſſed nation unfurl the banners of freedom. But above all, the events of the French revolution have produced the deepeſt ſolicitude, as well as the higheſt admiration. To call your nation brave were to pronounce but common praiſe. Wonderful people! Ages to come will read with aſtoniſhment the hiſtory of your brilliant exploits! I rejoice that the period of your toils and of your immenſe ſacrifices is approaching. I rejoice that the intereſting revolutionary movements of ſo many years have iſſued in the formation of a conſtitution deſigned to give permanency to the great object for which you have contended. I rejoice that liberty, which you have ſo long embraced with enthuſiaſm,—liberty, of which

which you have been the invincible defenders, now finds an aſylum in the boſom of a regularly organized government;—a government, which, being formed to ſecure the happineſs of the French people, correſponds with the ardent wiſhes of my heart, while it gratifies the pride of every citizen of the United States, by its reſemblance to their own.—On theſe glorious events, accept, Sir, my ſincere congratulations.

In delivering to you *theſe ſentiments*, I expreſs not my own feelings only, but thoſe of my fellow-citizens, in relation to *the commencement*, the *progreſs*, and the *iſſue of the French revolution* *: and they will cordially join with me in pureſt wiſhes to the Supreme Being, that the citizens of our ſiſter republic, our magnanimous allies, may ſoon enjoy in peace, that liberty, which they have purchaſed at ſo great a price, and all the happineſs which liberty can beſtow.

I receive, Sir, with lively ſenſibility, the ſymbol of the triumphs and of the enfranchiſement of your nation, the colours of France, which you have now preſented to the United States. The tranſaction will be announced to Congreſs; and the colours will be depoſited with thoſe archives of the United States, which are at once the evidences and the memorials of their freedom and independence. May theſe be perpetual! and may the friendſhip of the two republics be commenſurate with their exiſtence!

G. WASHINGTON.

There is nothing in this letter of the French Miniſter, which ſeems to call for a remark, after what I have ſaid on the letter of the Committee of Public Safety, except it be the cloſing ſentence;

* This was *after* the reign of Robeſpierre!

where he tells us, that the flag guides to combat men who have ſhared *our toils*, and who were prepared for liberty by *aiding us* to *acquire* our own.

The firſt thing I ſhall take notice of here, is, their aiding us to *acquire liberty*. If this be true, we knew not what liberty was before their arrival. We were, then, *ſlaves* to the King of Great Britain. Take care, Mr. Adet; you have touched on a tender ſtring here! What! Sir, were we ſlaves? And are we yet the *ſons of ſlaves?* If you find me one ſingle American (of Britiſh deſcent) who will allow that he is the *ſon of a ſlave*, I'll give you leave to guillotine me to-morrow morning, freſh and faſting.

The Preſident begins his anſwer by rejecting this degrading idea. "*Born*, Sir, *in a land of liberty.*" As if he had ſaid: No, no, Sir, I am no *freed man*; I was never a ſlave; I was *born* free.—"*Born*, Sir, "in a land of liberty; having *early* learned its va-"lue; having engaged in a perilous conflict to *de-*"*fend it*;" and not to *acquire it*. This is the language of every American that has too much reſpect for himſelf and his anceſtors, to allow that he is no better than a freed negro. To talk of *aiding us to acquire our liberty*, what is it but to put us on a footing with thoſe deluded wretches, whom Victor Hugues is now *aiding to acquire their liberty* at St. Vincent's and Granada?

And with reſpect to the *aid* that we received from France; there are but very few of us nowadays who are not well convinced, that that *aid* was afforded from motives that call for no mighty degree of gratitude; and even if we could ever have had a doubt of this, the expreſs declarations of the Convention would have removed it. But, ſuppoſing the aid to have been given from motives of pure love to us, and regard to our welfare; who gave it? Not the National Convention. It was a King, whom

whom that Convention has put to death.—The Miniſter tells us, that the flag "guides to combat, "men who have *ſhared our toils.*" What! did the armies of the Convention ever ſhare our toils? I fancy we ſhall find, that few of the men who ſhared our toils have eſcaped the fatal axe. Thoſe that did, are pining away their days in a diſmal dungeon, or are fled into ſome foreign land; nay, ſome of the men who ſhared our toils, are now ſharing the toils of the Britiſh, inſtead of the French armies.

Any hint of this kind might, then, have been ſpared at the preſenting of the thunderbolt flag; but, it ſeems, we are never to hear the laſt of this aſſiſtance received from France. Not a letter, not a communication, be it ever ſo ſhort or ſo trifling, do we ever receive without being reminded of it. It is a maxim, that, when once an obligation is mentioned by the obliging party, the obligation ceaſes. How often, then, has our obligation ceaſed? "Time was," ſays Macbeth, "when the breath "was out, men ceaſed to exiſt; but now they riſe "from their graves with twenty mortal murders on "their heads, and puſh us from our ſtools." So it is with our obligation to the French; in vain do we pay, in vain do we diſcharge it, in vain do they forfeit all demand on us; ſtill, like the griſly ghoſt of Banquo, does it riſe and ſtare us in the face. I hope our children, at any rate, will have the courage to ſay, "Shake not thy gory locks at us; thou "canſt not ſay 'twas we."

I do not know how my neighbours may think on this ſubject; but, for me, I cannot bear the idea of this everlaſting debt of gratitude. It lies like a mountain on my breaſt. Is it redeemable? if it be, for the love of Heaven, let us pay it off, and have done with it. If I can find but ten men to join me, I'll petition Congreſs to lay a poll-tax of a guinea a head

head for that purpoſe; that we may be able, once before we die, to ſay we are out of debt.

But it is time to come to the manner in which the Houſe of Repreſentatives received the flag, this pledge of the friendſhip of the Convention.

Mr. GILES informed the Houſe, that having been aware that the flag would be preſented to the Houſe this day, conſidering it as an additional teſtimony of the affection of France, and it having been the practice, on analogous occaſions, for the Houſe to expreſs their ſentiments independent of the other branch, he had prepared a reſolution expreſſive of what he conceived would be their ſenſe on the occaſion. It was nearly in the words following:

"*Reſolved*, That the Preſident of the United States be requeſted to make known to the Repreſentatives of the French People, that the Houſe has received with the moſt lively ſenſations the communications of the Committee of Public Safety, on the 21ſt of October, 1794, accompanied with the colours of the French Republic, and to aſſure them that the preſentation of the colours of France to the Congreſs of the United States is deemed a moſt honourable teſtimony of the exiſting ſympathy and affections of the two republics, founded upon their ſolid and reciprocal intereſts: that the Houſe rejoices in the opportunity of congratulating the French Republic on the brilliant and glorious achievements accompliſhed under it, during the preſent afflictive war, and that they hope thoſe achievements will be attended with a perfect attainment of their object, the permanent eſtabliſhment of the liberty and happineſs of that great and magnanimous people."

Mr. SEDGWICK wiſhed that a thouſand copies of the communications might be printed, and the farther

ther conſideration of the meſſage deferred till to-morrow.

Mr. HARPER and Mr. W. SMITH alſo recommended a delay. In the ſentiments of the reſolution they both agreed. Perhaps the wording might be ſomewhat altered.

Mr. SWANWICK was againſt poſtponing the conſideration of the meſſage, and obſerved that the Convention, on receiving a ſimilar preſent from this country, had proceeded inſtantly to a vote reſpecting it.

Mr. W. SMITH recommended to alter the wording of the reſolution, by inſerting *the Executive of France*, inſtead of *the Repreſentatives of the French People*, to whom the meſſage in reply was to be directed.

Mr. SHERBOURNE obſerved, that the difference of opinion reſpecting the branch of Government to which the anſwer of the Houſe ſhould be addreſſed, furniſhed an additional reaſon for a poſtponement. He highly reſpected the author of the motion, and believed his own feelings on the preſent occaſion as fervent as thoſe of any member. And though the feelings of the Houſe might not be as *ardent* on the morrow as at this moment, yet he preſumed that the ſentiment would be the ſame. He conceived that it would be more ſatisfactory to the Republic, and more conſiſtent with the dignity of the Houſe, that their anſwer ſhould be the reſult of cool deliberation, than a ſudden impulſe of enthuſiaſm, which the preſent occaſion was calculated to inſpire. He would therefore move that the farther conſideration of the reſolution on the table be poſtponed till to-morrow.

Mr. SWANWICK thought a poſtponement in this caſe, as in many others, would only be a waſte of time. The motion was negatived. Mr. W. Smith's amendment

amendment was then taken up, and, after ſome converſation, was alſo negatived.

Mr. Parker moved an amendment as follows: "That this Houſe has received with the moſt *ſincere and* lively ſenſibility," &c. The amendment was for inſerting the two words in italics, to which the Houſe conſented. The meſſage was then voted unanimouſly, and a thouſand copies of the communications and reſolutions were ordered to be printed. A Committee of two members was appointed to wait on the Preſident, and inform him of the reſolution agreed to by the Houſe.

Oh, fy! Mr. Sedgwick! how could you propoſe to put off the conſideration of this charming ſubject till the next day? A delay of a whole twenty-four hours! Upon my word, Sir, ſuch a propoſition indicated but little regard for our fifter Republic. How different the conduct of Mr. Giles! He comes to the Houſe with a *reſolution* in his pocket, ready prepared, even before the communication is received. Happy member! He has thus got the ſtart of you all in the affections of our very dear allies. Mr. Parker made, indeed, a puſh to come in with him, by adding the word *ſincere*; but we all know that the firſt ſtep is every thing in like caſes.—*Sincere* and *lively* are not, 'tis true, the propereſt epithets that could be placed before the word *ſenſibility*; but it would be mere pedantry to ſubject to rules of propriety, a reſolution dictated by that "ſudden impulſe of *enthuſiaſm*, which the preſent occaſion "was calculated to inſpire."

Mr. Swanwick (don't ſmile, reader) ſaw, at once, the impropriety of poſtponing the conſideration; becauſe—becauſe what?—becauſe "the Con-"vention, on receiving a ſimilar *preſent* from *this* "*country*, had proceeded inſtantly to a vote reſpect-"ing it."—And who told you, my dear little orator,

tor, that "the Convention had received a ſimilar "*preſent* from *this country?*"—Who is *this country?* What is it? I am well informed that neither the Government nor the Legiſlature knew any thing at all about the matter, till an account of it appeared in the newſpapers; and you are not to learn, I preſume, that whatever an ambaſſador does of his own head, is in no wiſe binding on his country. But ſuppoſe even that the American flag delivered to the Convention, had been a preſent from this country, their manner of receiving it could have but little weight here, with men who were not devoted to their intereſts rather than to thoſe of America. How long, I pray, have their meaſures become precedents here? "They proceeded to a vote inſtantly." And when did they do otherwiſe? When did they heſitate? When they decreed that each department ſhould *build a ſhip of the line*, there was no heſitation, any more than when they decreed that there ſhould be *no more beggars* in France, and *no more kings* in Europe. Beſides, if you are to imitate the Convention, I'll aſſure you, you muſt make a very conſiderable change in the Houſe of Repreſentatives. You muſt have half a dozen negroes and mulattoes amongſt you; and it would have been neceſſary, the day before the reception of this pretty preſent, for your Speaker to receive and embrace an old negro woman at the head of her many-coloured progeny. Even the ceremony itſelf muſt have undergone a change; for the American flag was carried to the Convention by an *American*; conſequently the French flag ſhould have been brought in by a *Frenchman*; and, if the imitation was to be perfect in all its parts, your Speaker ſhould have deſcended from his ſeat, and given this bearer the fraternal hug. How vain, then, was it to talk about imitations! Before you aſpire to this ſublime perfection in patriotiſm, you and your party muſt raiſe us to the

height

height of the French people; a change more eaſy to attempt than accompliſh, whatever you may pleaſe to think of it.

As I have already taken up ſo much of the reader's time with this flag, I ſhall not, at preſent, enter into an inquiry whether it was proper, or not, to make the Preſident of the United States a ſort of go-between to the Congreſs and the Convention; nor ſhall I aſk how the American Ambaſſador at Paris came to think of involving his Government in ſuch an affair; I ſhall only obſerve, that, as I believe it is the firſt inſtance of legiſlative aſſemblies ſending preſents to each other, ſo, I hope, it will be the laſt.

THE END OF CENSOR, NO. I.

THE

BLOODY BUOY,

THROWN OUT AS A

Warning to the political Pilots of all Nations:

OR, A

FAITHFUL RELATION

OF A MULTITUDE OF

ACTS OF HORRID BARBARITY,

SUCH AS THE EYE NEVER WITNESSED, THE TONGUE EXPRESSED, OR THE IMAGINATION CONCEIVED, UNTIL THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE

FRENCH REVOLUTION.

TO WHICH IS ADDED

AN INSTRUCTIVE ESSAY,

Tracing these dreadful Effects to their real Causes.

"You will plunge your country into an abyss of eternal detestation and "infamy; and the annals of your boasted revolution will serve as a BLOODY "BUOY, warning the nations of the earth to keep aloof from the mighty "ruin."

Abbé Maury's Speech to the National Assembly.

INTRODUCTION.

THE object of the following work is to give the people of America a ſtriking and experimental proof of the horrible effects of anarchy and infidelity.

The neceſſity of ſuch an undertaking, at this time, would have been, in a great meaſure, precluded, had our public prints been conducted with that impartiality and undaunted adherence to truth, which the intereſts of the community and of ſuffering humanity demanded from them. But, ſo far from this, the greater part of thoſe vehicles of information have moſt induſtriouſly concealed, or gloſſed over, the actions, as well as the motives of the ruling powers in France; they have extenuated all their unheard-of acts of tyranny, on the falſe, but ſpecious pretence, that they were conducive to the eſtabliſhment of a free government; and one of their editors has not bluſhed to declare, that "it "would be *an eaſy matter to apologize for all the maſ-* "*ſacres* that have taken place in that country."

We have ſeen, indeed, ſome exceptions; ſome few prints that have not diſhonoured themſelves by going this length: but even theſe have obſerved a timid ſilence, and have avoided ſpeaking of the ſhocking barbarities of the French, with as much caution as if we were to partake in the diſgrace, and as if it was in our power to hide them from the world, and from poſterity. If they have now and then given way to a juſt indignation, this has been done in ſuch a manner, and has been ſo timid, as to do them but little honour. They have acted the part of the tyrannized people of Paris: they have

huzza'd every ſucceeding tyrant while on the theatre of power, and, the inſtant he was transferred to a ſcaffold, they have covered him with reproach. They have attributed to factions, to individuals, what was the work of the national repreſentatives, and of the nation itſelf. They have, in ſhort, inveighed againſt the murderers of the fallen aſſaſſins, while they have, in the ſame breath, applauded the principles on which they acted, and on which their ſurvivors and their partiſans do ſtill act.

Thus has the liberty of the preſs, a liberty of which we ſo juſtly boaſt, been not only uſeleſs to us during this terrible convulſion of the civilized world, but has been ſo perverted as to lead us into errors, which had well nigh plunged us into the ſituation of our diſtracted allies. Nor are we yet ſecure. Diſorganizing and blaſphemous principles have been diſſeminated among us with but too much ſucceſs; and, unleſs we profit from the awful example before us, we may yet experience all the calamities that Heaven and earth now call on us to deplore.

Fully impreſſed with this perſuaſion, the author of theſe ſheets has ventured to undeceive the miſguided; to tear aſide the veil, and ſhow to a yet happy people the dangers they have to fear. With this object in view, he has too much confidence in the good ſenſe and piety of the major part of his countrymen, not to be aſſured, that his efforts will be ſeconded by their zeal in the cauſe of order and religion.

The materials for the work have been collected from different publications, *all written by Frenchmen*, and all, except one, from which only a few extracts were made, *printed at Paris*.

Well aware that perſons of a certain deſcription will leave nothing untried to diſcredit a performance of this nature, the author has taken particular care

to mention the work, and even the page, from which each fact is extracted.

He foreſees that the cant of *modern patriotiſm* will be poured forth againſt him on this occaſion. He knows that he ſhall be repreſented as an enemy of the French nation, and of the cauſe of liberty. To this he will anſwer beforehand, with the frankneſs of a man who thinks no freedom equal to that of ſpeaking the truth. As to the individuals compoſing this formerly amiable nation, many of them, and he hopes very many, are ſtill entitled to his love and eſteem. He has, from his infancy, been an admirer of their ſprightly wit; he owes a thouſand obligations to their officious hoſpitality, and has long boaſted of their friendſhip. But with reſpect to the *regenerated* French, he would bluſh to be thought their friend, after what he has recorded in this volume. And, as to the cauſe of liberty, if that cauſe is to be maintained by falſehood, blaſphemy, robbery, violation, and murder, he is, and truſts he ever ſhall be, its avowed and mortal enemy.

THE

BLOODY BUOY,

&c. &c.

CHAP. I.

FACTS taken from *L'Hiſtoire du Clergé François*, or, *The Hiſtory of the French Clergy*, by Abbé *Barruel*.

IT will be recollected by the greater part of my readers, that ſoon after the beginning of the French revolution, the National Aſſembly conceived the plan of deſtroying the religion of their forefathers. In order to effect this, they ſeparated the Gallican church from that of Rome, and impoſed an oath on the clergy, which they could not take without becoming apoſtates in the fulleſt ſenſe of the word. All the worthy and conſcientious part of that body refuſed of courſe, and this refuſal was made a pretext to drive them from their livings, and fill the vacancies with ſuch as had more pliant conſciences, principles better adapted to the impious ſyſtem which the leaders in the Aſſembly had prepared for their too credulous countrymen.

The ejectment of the prieſthood was attended with numberleſs acts of moſt atrocious and wanton cruelty: theſe have been recorded by the *Abbé Barruel*, in a work entitled, *The Hiſtory of the French Clergy*; and though what is here to be found will dwindle into nothing, when compared to what I have extracted

from other works, yet it could not be wholly omitted, without ſhowing a degree of inſenſibility for the ſufferings of theſe men, that I am perſuaded the reader would not have excuſed. I ſhall therefore begin the relation with ſome extracts from that work.

It will be obſerved that theſe extracts, as well as all thoſe that compoſe this compilation, are an abridged tranſlation from the French; but as far as relates to thoſe contained in this chapter, the American reader may eaſily verify the tranſlation by examining the Engliſh edition of the Abbé *Barruel*'s work, which is to be found in moſt parts of the Union.

Page 104.—Soon after the firſt National Aſſembly had decreed that the Comtat of Avignon belonged to the French nation, an army of aſſaſſins, of whom one Jourdan, ſurnamed the Cut-throat, was the commander, took poſſeſſion of the unfortunate city of Avignon. The churches were immediately pillaged, the ſacred vaſes profaned and carried off, and the altars levelled to the ground. The priſons were ſoon filled, and the unhappy victims were releaſed only to ſuffer death. A deep pit was dug to receive their dead bodies, ſix hundred of which were thrown into it, mangled and diſtorted, before ten o'clock the next day. Among them was Mr. Nolhac, a prieſt, in the eightieth year of his age. He had been thirty years rector of St. Simphorien, a pariſh which he preferred to all others, and which he could not be prevailed on to quit for a more lucrative one, becauſe he would not deſert the poor. During his rectorſhip he had been the common father of his pariſhioners, the refuge of the indigent, the comforter of the afflicted, and the friend and counſellor of every honeſt man. When the hour of danger approached, his friends adviſed him to fly: but no entreaties could prevail on him to abandon his flock: "No," ſaid the good old man, "I have

"watched

" watched over them in the halcyon days of peace, " and ſhall I now leave them 'mid ſtorms and tem- " peſts, without a guide, without any one to comfort " them in their laſt dreary moments?" Mr. Nolhac, who, till now, had been reſpected even by the cut-throats, was ſent to the priſon the evening before the execution. His appearance and his ſalutation were thoſe of a conſoling angel: " I come, my children, " to die with you: we ſhall ſoon appear in the pre- " ſence of that God whom we ſerve, and who will " not deſert us in the hour of death." He fortified their drooping courage, adminiſtered the laſt con-ſolatory pledges of his love, and the next day em-braced and cheered each individual as he was called forth by the murderers. Two of theſe ſtood at the door with a bar of iron in their hands, and as the priſoners advanced knocked them down: the bodies were then delivered over to the other ruffians, who hacked and disfigured them with their ſabres before they threw them into the pit, that they might not af-terwards be known by their friends and relations.—When the cut-throats were diſperſed, every one was anxious to find the body of Mr. Nolhac. It was at laſt diſcovered by the caſſock, and the crucifix which he wore on his breaſt. It had been pierced in fifty places, and the ſcull was maſhed to pieces.

Page 210.—Several prieſts were conducted to La-grave, where they were told that they muſt take the oath *, or ſuffer death. Among them was Sul-pician, of 98 years of age, and a young Abbé of the name of Novi. The whole choſe death, the vene-rable Sulpician leading the way. The trial of Mr. Novi was particularly ſevere. The ruffians brought his father to the ſpot, and told him, if he

* This oath amounted to neither more nor leſs than direct per-jury: ſince, by taking it, they muſt break the oath they had made when they entered the prieſthood.

could perſuade his ſon to ſwear, he ſhould live. The tender old man, wavering, heſitating between the feelings of nature and the duties of religion, at laſt yields to parental fondneſs, throws his arms round his child's neck, buries his face in his boſom, and with tears and ſobs preſſes his compliance. "O! my child, my child, ſpare the life of your "father!"—"My deareſt father! my deareſt fa-"ther," returned the Abbé, "I will do more. I will "die worthy of you and my God. You educated "me a Catholic: I am a prieſt, a ſervant of the "Lord. It will be a greater comfort to you in "your gray hairs, to have your ſon a martyr than "an apoſtate."—The villains tear them aſunder, and, amidſt the cries and lamentations of the father, extend the ſon before him a bleeding corpſe.

Page 211.—In the ſame town, and on the ſame day, the axe was ſuſpended over the head of Mr. Teron, when the revolutioniſts bethought them that he had a ſon. This ſon was about ten years of age, and, in order to enjoy the father's torments and the child's tears both at a time, he was brought to the place of execution. His tears and cries gave a reliſh to the ferocious banquet. After tiring themſelves with the ſpectacle, they put the father to death before the eyes of the child, whom they beſmeared with his blood.

Page 217.—After having ſpoken of the conduct of the magiſtrates and mob at Bourdeaux, the hiſtorian mentions the death of Mr. Langoiran and Abbé Dupuis, thus:

At the entrance of the court-houſe, the Abbé Dupuis received a firſt wound; others ſoon levelled him to the ground. A young lad of about fifteen or ſixteen cut a hole in the cheek with a knife, to hold up the head by, while others were employed in haggling

in haggling it from the body, which was ſtill in agonies. This operation not ſucceeding in ſuch a crowd, they took hold of the legs, and dragged the carcaſs about the ſtreets and round the ramparts.

Mr. Langoiran had but juſt ſet his foot on the firſt ſtep of the ſtairs, when he was knocked down. His head was hacked off in an inſtant, and a ruffian held it up, crying aloud, "Off with your hats! long "live the nation!" The bareheaded populace anſwered, "Long live the nation!" The head was then carried round the town in ſignal of a triumph gained by a tumultuous populace and ten thouſand ſoldiers under arms, over a poor defenceleſs prieſt.

Page 218.—The 14th of July, ſo famous in the annals of the revolution, was this year celebrated at Limoges, by the death of Mr. Chabrol. He was a moſt uſeful member of ſociety; diſtinguiſhed round his neighbourhood as a bone-ſetter; he was at once the ſurgeon and the paſtor of his pariſhioners; and among his murderers were ſome of thoſe who owed to him the uſe of their limbs. He was of a quick and impetuous temper, and endued with uncommon bodily ſtrength. His death certainly was not that of a Chriſtian martyr; but it deſerves particular notice, as a ſtriking proof of the cowardly ferocity of the French populace.

He had taken ſhelter at a magiſtrate's, and begged leave to elude the mob by going out of the houſe the back way; but the magiſtrate durſt not comply. He was forced to face his blood-thirſty purſuers. The indignant prieſt met them at the door; the attack inſtantly began. Without a ſingle weapon of defence, he had to encounter hundreds of the mob, armed with clubs, guns, ſabres, and knives; but, notwithſtanding the amazing inequality, he held them a long time at bay. Some he felled to the ground, others ran from him; he tore

tore a bayonet out of his flesh, and stabbing it into the breast of his adversary, sent him to die among the crowd. At last, weakened with the loss of blood, he falls, and the base and mercileſs scoundrels cry, *To the lamp-post!* The idea of hanging reanimates the remaining drops in his veins. He rises upon his legs for the last time; but numbers prevailed: again he falls, covered with wounds, and expires. His last groan is followed by the ferocious howl of *Victory!* The dastardly assassins set no bounds to their insults; they cut and hacked his body to pieces, and wrangled for the property of his ragged and bloody caſſock.

Page 268.—As soon as the unfortunate Louis XVI. had been transferred from his throne to a loathsome prison, the National Assembly formed a plan for the total extirpation of the priests, and with them the Christian religion. The ministers of the altar were seized and thrown into prison, or transported from every part of the country. At Paris, about three hundred of them were shut up, in order to be massacred, and were actually put to death during the first and second weeks of September, 1792.

About one hundred and eighty of these unhappy men were confined in the convent of the Carmelites. A troop of assassins commenced the massacre in the garden where the priests were permitted to take the air; but while they were proceeding a Commissary arrived, and informed them that the work was not to go on that way. There were now about a hundred left alive, who were all ordered into the sanctuary of the church; but, to get thither, they had to pass through a crowd of their murderers. One received a ball, another a blow, and another a stab; so that when arrived in the sanctuary, they presented a scene the most heart-piercing that eyes ever

ever beheld. Some were dragged in wounded, others quite dead. Even here, though ſurrounded by a detachment of ſoldiers, the blood-thirſty mob ruſhed in upon them, and murdered ſeveral at the very altar. The ſanctuary of a Chriſtian church was, for the firſt time ſince the bleſſed Redeemer appeared among men, filled with a promiſcuous group of the living, the dying, and the dead. The marble pavement was covered with dirt, and gore, and mangled carcaſſes; and the ſides of the altar ſplaſhed with blood and brains.

The ſoldiers had not been brought to ſave the lives of the prieſts: the Commiſſary who headed them was to execute a plan of more deliberate murder. The ſurviving prieſts were called out two at a time, and murdered in the preſence of the Commiſſary, who took their names down in a book, as he was anſwerable for their aſſaſſination. Of all that were found here, only four or five eſcaped.—The like undiſtinguiſhed carnage was exhibited at the other priſons.

Every one of theſe men might have ſaved his life by taking the proffered oath, yet not one of them condeſcended to do it. Let the infidel ſhow us, if he can, any thing like this in the annals of his impious ſect.

Page 318.—At the gate of the priſon of La Force, the aſſaſſins were placed in two rows: the two ruffians called Judges, who gave the ſignal of death, were placed at the gate; and, as ſoon as the priſoner paſſed them, the aſſaſſins diſpatched him with their knives or ſabres, throwing the bodies in a heap at the end of the line. At the foot of this trophy of dead bodies, ſays the hiſtorian, we muſt now exhibit a ſcene of a different kind, in the murder of the Princeſs of Lamballe. She had retired in ſafety to London; but her attachment to the royal family would

would not ſuffer her to remain in her aſylum, while they were expoſed. Her fidelity was a crime that the infidelity of her enemies could never forgive.

When this illuſtrious victim was brought forth, ſhe was aſked to ſwear an eternal hatred to the King, the Queen, and to royalty. "The oath," ſaid ſhe, "is foreign to the ſentiments of my heart, and I "will never take it."—She was inſtantly delivered over to the miniſters of death. Theſe ruffians pretend to careſs her, ſtroke her cheeks with their hands, yet reeking with human blood, and thus conduct her along the line. Amidſt all theſe inſults her courage never deſerted her. When arrived at the heap of dead bodies, ſhe was ordered to kneel and aſk pardon of the nation: "I have never in-"jured the nation," ſhe replied, "nor will I aſk "its pardon."—"Down," ſaid they, "and aſk "pardon, if you wiſh to live."—"No," ſaid ſhe, "I ſcorn to aſk pardon from aſſaſſins that call them-"ſelves the nation: I will never bend my knee, or "accept of a favour at ſuch hands."

Her ſoul was ſuperior to fear. "Kneel and aſk "pardon," was heard from a thouſand voices, but in vain. Two of the aſſaſſins now ſeized her arms, and pulling her from ſide to ſide, nearly diſlocated her ſhoulders. "Go on, ſcoundrels," ſaid the heroic Princeſs, "I will aſk no pardon." In a rage to ſee themſelves thus overcome by the conſtancy of a woman, they daſhed her down, and ruſhed in upon her with their knives and poniards. Her head ſoon appeared hoiſted upon a liberty pike, and her heart, after *being bit* by one of the ruffians, was put into a baſin. Both were carried in triumph through the ſtreets of Paris. At laſt, after having feaſted the eyes of the multitude, the bearers took them to the Temple, now become a priſon; where one of the two Commiſſaries that guarded the King, called him

him to the window, that he might ſee it; but his companion, a little more humane, prevented the unfortunate Monarch from approaching. A fainting fit, from hearing of the event, fortunately ſaved the Queen from the heart-rending ſight.

The body ſtripped naked, and the bowels hanging out, was expoſed to view on the top of the murdered victims, where it remained till the maſſacre was over.

Page 327.—A great fire was made in the Place Dauphine, at which many, both men and women, were roaſted. The Counteſs of Perignan, with her three daughters, were dragged thither. They were ſtripped, rubbed over with oil, and then put to the fire. The eldeſt of the daughters, who was fifteen, begged them to put an end to her torments, and a young fellow ſhot her through the head. The cannibals, who were ſhouting and dancing round the fire, enraged to ſee themſelves thus deprived of the pleaſure of hearing her cries, ſeized the too merciful murderer, and threw him into the flames.

When the Counteſs was dead, they brought ſix prieſts, and cutting off ſome of the roaſted fleſh, preſented them each a piece to eat. They ſhut their eyes, and made no anſwer. The oldeſt of the prieſts was then ſtripped and tied oppoſite the fire. The mob told the others, that perhaps they might preſer the reliſh of a prieſt's fleſh to that of a Counteſs; but they ſuddenly ruſhed into the flames. The barbarians tore them out, to prolong their torments; not, however, before they were dead, and beyond the reach even of Pariſian cruelty.

Page 328.—On Monday, September 3d, at ten o'clock in the evening, a man, or rather a monſter, named Philip, living in the ſtreet of the Temple, came to the Jacobin Club, of which he was a member, and, with a box in his hand, mounted the tribune,

bune. Here he made a long ſpeech on patriotiſm, concluding by a declaration, that he looked upon every one who preferred the ties of blood and of nature to that of patriotic duty, as an ariſtocrat worthy of death; and, to convince them of the purity and ſincerity of his own principles, he opened the box, and held up by the gray hair, the bloody and ſhrivelled heads of his father and mother, "which I "have cut off," ſaid the impious wretch, "becauſe "they obſtinately perſiſted in not hearing maſs from "a conſtitutional prieſt *." The ſpeech of this parricide received the loudeſt applauſes; and the two heads were ordered to be buried beneath the buſts of Ankerſtrom and Brutus, behind the Preſident's chair †.

The laſt fact related is of ſuch a horrid nature, that though ſo well authenticated, it would almoſt ſtagger our belief, had we not proof of ſo many others which equal, if not ſurpaſs it. I ſhall here extract one from *La Conjuration de Maximilien Robeſpierre*, a work publiſhed at Paris in the year 1795.

The author, after ſpeaking of the unnatural ferociouſneſs which the revolution had produced in the hearts of the people, ſays (page 162), I will here give a proof, and a ſhocking one it is.—Garnier of Orleans had a ſon, who had been intended for the prieſthood, and had been initiated in the ſubdeacon-

* That is, one of the apoſtates.

† According to Monſieur Peltier, in his Picture of Paris, the number of perſons murdered in the different priſons of that city, from Sunday the 2d to Friday the 7th of September, 1792, amounted to 1005. To theſe, he ſays, ſhould be added, the poor creatures who were put to death in the hoſpital of Bicêtre, and in the yards of La Salpetrière; thoſe who were drowned at the hoſpital of La Force; and all thoſe who were dragged out of the dungeons of the Conciergerie and the Chatelet, to be butchered on the Pont-au-Change, which may be computed, without exaggeration, at 8000 individuals.

ſhip;

ſhip; conſequently he was attached to the Chriſtian faith. His father one day ſeized him by the throat, and led him to the Revolutionary Tribunal, where he was inſtantly condemned; nor would the barbarous father quit his child till he ſaw his head ſevered from his body. After the execution was over, the tribunal, ever as capricious as bloody, feigned remorſe, and were proceeding to condemn the father; but the National Convention, informed of the affair, annulled the proceſs, and publicly applauded the conduct of the unnatural father, as an imitator of the republican Brutus.

In the extracts from the Hiſtory of the French Clergy, the propoſed limits of this work have obliged me to forego the pleaſure of mentioning a great number of facts which reflect infinite honour on that calumniated and unfortunate body of men, as well as on the Chriſtian religion. The following trait, however, I cannot prevail on myſelf to omit.

Page 341.—At Rheims lived a man, who, from the number of his years, might be called the Dean of Chriſtendom; and, from the fame of his virtues, the Prieſt, by excellence. He had long been known by no other name than that of the Holy Prieſt. This was Mr. Pacquot, rector of St. John's. When the revolutionary aſſaſſins broke into his oratory they found him on his knees. A true and faithful diſciple of Jeſus Chriſt, he yielded himſelf into the hands of his executioners without ſo much as a murmur, and ſuffered himſelf to be led before the ferocious magiſtrate, as a lamb to the ſlaughter. He croſſed the ſtreet ſinging the Pſalms of David, while the ſanguinary ruffians that conducted him endeavoured to drown his voice by their blaſphemies. At the threſhold of the town-hall an attempt was made to murder him, but the mayor interfered, ſaying

ſaying to the people, "What are you about? This "old fellow is beneath notice. He is a fool: fana-"ticiſm has turned his brain." Theſe words rouſed the venerable old man. "No, Sir," ſays he, "I "am neither a fool nor a fanatic, nor ſhall my life "take refuge under ſuch an ignominious ſhelter. I "wiſh you to know, that I was never more in my "ſober ſenſes. Theſe men have tendered to me an "oath decreed by the National Aſſembly. I am "well acquainted with the nature of this oath: I "know that it is impious, and ſubverſive of religion. "They leave me the choice of the oath or death, "and I chooſe the latter.—I hope, Sir, I have con-"vinced you that I am in my ſenſes, and know per-"fectly well what I am about."—The nettled magiſtrate immediately abandoned him to the mob. "Which of you," ſaid the old man, "is to have the "patriotic honour of being my murderer?"—"I "am," ſays a man who moved in a ſphere that ought to have diſtinguiſhed him from a horde of ruffians. "Let me embrace you, then," ſays Mr. Pacquot; which he actually did, and prayed to God to forgive him. This done, the hard-hearted villain gave him the firſt blow, and his companions buried their bayonets in his emaciated breaſt.

The reader's heart will, I hope, teach him the love and veneration that every Chriſtian ought to feel for the memory of this evangelical old man.

If the death of all the murdered prieſts was not marked with ſuch unequivocal proofs of conſtancy and fidelity as that as Mr. Pacquot, it was, perhaps, becauſe a like opportunity did not always preſent itſelf. One thing we know, that, by taking an oath contrary to their faith, they might not only have eſcaped the knives of their aſſaſſins, but might have enjoyed an annual income. Their refuſing to do this is an incontrovertible teſtimony that they were

no impoſtors or hypocrites, but ſincere believers of the religion they taught, and that they valued that religion more than life itſelf: and this is the beſt anſwer that can poſſibly be given to all the ſcandalous and atrocious calumnies that their enemies and the enemies of Chriſtianity have vomited forth againſt them.

CHAP. II.

FACTS *taken from La Relation des Cruautés commiſes dans les Lyonnois.*

THE next work that preſents itſelf, following the chronological order, is, *La Relation des Cruautés commiſes dans les Lyonnois*; or, *The Relation of the Cruelties committed in the Lyonneſe.*

Page 37.—The grand ſcene of deſtruction and maſſacre was opened in the once flouriſhing and opulent city of Lyons, by a public profanation of all thoſe things that had been looked upon as ſacred. The murderers in chief, choſen from among the members of the National Convention, were a play-actor, and a man who under the old Government had been a bum-bailiff. Their firſt ſtep was to brutify the minds of the populace; to extinguiſh the remaining ſparks of humanity and religion, by teaching them to ſet Heaven and an hereafter at defiance; in order to prepare them for the maſſacres which they were commiſſioned to execute.

A mock proceſſion was formed in imitation of thoſe obſerved by the Catholic church. It was headed by a troop of men bearing in their hands the chalices and other vaſes which had been taken from the plundered churches. At the head of the proceſſion there was an aſs, dreſſed in the veſtments of the prieſts that the revolutionary army had murdered in the neighbourhood of the city, with a mitré on his head. This beaſt, a beaſt of the ſame kind on

which our Redeemer rode, now bore a load of crucifixes and other ſymbols of the Chriſtian religion; having the Old and New Teſtament tied to his tail. When this proceſſion came to the ſpot which had been fixed on for the purpoſe, the Bible was burnt, and the aſs given to drink out of the ſacramental cup, amidſt the ſhouts and rejoicings of the blaſphemous aſſiſtants.

Such a beginning plainly foretold what was to follow. An undiſtinguiſhing butchery of all the rich immediately commenced. Hundreds of perſons, women as well as men, were taken out of the city at a time, tied to trees, ſhot to death, ſtabbed, or elſe knocked on the head. In the city the guillotine never ceaſed a moment; it was ſhifted three times; holes were dug at each place to receive the blood, and yet it ran in the gutters.

It were impoſſible to deſcribe this ſcene of carnage, or to give an account of each act of the, till now, unheard-of barbarity; two or three, however, demand a particular mention.

Page 39.—Madam Lauras, hearing that her huſband was condemned, went, accompanied with her ten children, and threw herſelf on her knees before the ferocious Collot d'Herbois, one of the members of the Convention; but no mercy could be expected from a wretch, whoſe buſineſs it was to kill. She followed her beloved huſband to the place of execution, ſurrounded with her weeping offſpring. On ſeeing him fall, her cries, and the wildneſs of her looks, but too plainly foretold her approaching end. She was ſeized with the pains of a premature childbirth, and was carried home to her houſe, where a Commiſſary ſoon after arrived, drove her from her bed and her houſe, from the door of which ſhe fell dead into the ſtreet.

Page 41.—Two women who had perſiſted in aſking the life of their huſbands, were tied, during

ſix

ſix hours, to the poſts of the guillotine. Their own huſbands were executed before their eyes, and their blood ſprinkled over them.

Page 42.—Miſs Servan, a young lady of about eighteen, was put to death becauſe ſhe would not diſcover the retreat of her father.

Page 47.—Madame Cochet was condemned for having put a match to the cannon during the ſiege, and for having aſſiſted in her huſband's eſcape. She was declared, by two ſurgeons, to be with child; but this was a reaſon of little weight with men whom we ſhall by and by ſee murdering infants, and even ripping them from the womb. She was inſtantly executed.

Page 101.—To theſe facts I ſhall add the death of Maupetit. He was made priſoner during the ſiege, buried alive up to his neck, and in this ſituation had his head maſhed to pieces with ſmall cannon-balls, which his enemies toſſed at it with all the inſulting grimaces of ſavages.

Page 104.—At Lyons the prieſts met with the ſame treatment as at other places, and honoured their deaths with the ſame unſhaken fortitude. Twenty-ſeven were executed at one time, not one of whom had condeſcended to accept of the ſhameful conditions that were offered, nor even to ſolicit a pardon from the vile and blaſphemous aſſaſſins.

During this murderous work, the city of Lyons was ſtruck with terror. The members of the Convention ſtuck up a proclamation, declaring all thoſe who ſhould expreſs the leaſt ſymptom of pity, *ſuſpected perſons*. When the blood had, in ſome meaſure, ceaſed to flow, and the affrighted inhabitants ventured out of their houſes, they were ſeen walking along the ſtreets with their eyes fixed on the ground: men no longer ſtopped, ſhook hands, and gave each other good-morrow. The fear of death was ſtamped on every face: children

durſt not aſk after their parents, nor parents aſk after their children.

The villages round about ſhared in the fate of the city. An apoſtate prieſt conducted a gang of ruffians, who carried fire and death before them among thoſe good people, whoſe only crime was giving ſhelter to perſons eſcaped from the maſſacre. The charitable hoſt and his affrighted gueſt were butchered together beneath the hoſpitable roof, while the wives and daughters were reſerved to ſatisfy the brutal appetites of the murderers.

In vain ſhould I attempt to give the reader an adequate idea of the crimes committed, by the order of the Convention, in this part of France. The author of *La Conjuration de Robeſpierre* ſays (page 159), that in the ſpace of a few months, the number of perſons who were murdered in the Lyonneſe, and in the ſurrounding foreſts, amounted to two hundred thouſand.

I ſhall conclude this chapter with a fact or two taken from *La Conjuration de Robeſpierre*.

Page 210.—Though no torments could go beyond the merits of Robeſpierre and his colleagues, yet, even in the execution of theſe monſters, the Pariſians diſcovered ſuch traits of ferociouſneſs, as fully proved that theſe grovelling tyrants had done no more than what they themſelves would have done, had they been in their places.

Robeſpierre had been wounded in his head and face; his jaws were held together with bandages; and the executioner, before he placed his neck under the guillotine, ſuddenly tore off the bandages, letting his under jaw fall, while the blood ſtreamed down his breaſt. The poor deſerted wretch was kept ſome time in this frightful ſtate, while the air reſounded with the acclamations of the barbarous populace.

Page 209.—Henriot had no other clothes on but a ſhirt

a ſhirt and a waiſtcoat, covered with dirt and blood. His hair was clotted, and his aſſaſſinating hands were now ſtained with his own gore. He had been wounded all over; one eye he kept ſhut, while the other was ſtarted from its ſocket, and held only by its fibres. This horrid ſpectacle, from which the imagination turns with diſguſt and affright, excited the joy, and even the mirth of the Pariſians. "Look at the ſcoundrel," ſaid they, "juſt as he was when he aſſiſted in murdering the "prieſts." The people called on the carts to ſtop, and a group of *women* performed *a dance* round that in which the capital offenders rode.—When Henriot was ſtepping from the cart to the ſcaffold, one of the under-executioners, to divert the ſpectators, tore out the eye that was already looſe.—What a hard-hearted wretch muſt he be who could perform an action like this! and to what a degree of baſeneſs and ferocity muſt that people be arrived, who could thus be diverted!

Page 163.—We ſhall not be ſurpriſed that this thirſt for human blood, and delight in beholding the torments of the dying, were become ſo prevalent, when we know that *mock executions* were become *a ſport*. The women ſuſpended to the necks of their ſucking infants, corals made in the ſhape of the guillotine; which the child, by the means of a ſpring, played as perfectly as the bloody executioner himſelf.

Page 161.—What could be expected from an education like this? What could be expected from children who were taught to uſe an inſtrument of ignominious death as a plaything; who were taught to laugh at the ſcreams of the dying, and who, in a manner, ſucked in blood with their mothers' milk? When aſſaſſinations became the ſports of children, it is no wonder that the ſentiments of nature were extinguiſhed, and that perfidy and inhumanity took

place of gratitude, filial piety, and all the tender affections.

What I am now going to relate, the mothers of future generations will hear with affright.—A child of ten years of age had been ſcolded, perhaps whipped, by his mother. He ran to the Revolutionary Tribunal, and accuſed her of being ſtill attached to the Catholic religion. The accuſation was admitted, the boy recompenſed, and the mother executed in a few hours afterwards.

Tell us, ye mothers, for you only can know, what this poor creature muſt feel at ſeeing herſelf betrayed, and ready to be deprived of life, by the child ſhe had borne in her womb, who but the other day hung at her breaſt, and for whom alone, perhaps, ſhe wiſhed to live!

Page 162.—In ſhort, ſays the author, men contracted ſuch a taſte as excites horror even to believe it poſſible. God forbid that I ſhould enter into particulars on this ſubject. The bowels of the reader would not permit him to proceed. Suffice it to ſay, that we have ſeen the time, when man was becoming the *food* of man. *Thoſe who practiſed anatomy* during the reign of terror, know but too well what I could ſay here, if compaſſion for the feelings of my readers did not prevent me.

I cannot quit theſe facts, without once more referring the reader to the work from which I have ſelected them. I wiſh him not to depend on my veracity, for the truth of what he may find in a book written on the ſcene. *La Conjuration de Robeſpierre* is to be had almoſt any where: I have ſeen above a dozen copies of it in the hands of different perſons. It was, as I have already ſaid, publiſhed at Paris, and, therefore, we may reſt aſſured that the author has not exaggerated; but, on the contrary, we ſee by the laſt article here quoted, that he

he was afraid to ſay all that truth would have warranted.

CHAP. III.

FACTS ſelected from the *Procès Criminel des Membres du Comité Revolutionnaire de Nantes, et du ci-devant Repreſentant du Peuple Carrier*; or, *Trial of the Members of the Revolutionary Committee at Nantz, and of the Repreſentative Carrier.*

THE work which we are now entering on, was publiſhed at Paris during the laſt year; but, as an introduction to the facts extracted from it, it will be neceſſary to give the reader a conciſe ſketch of the progreſs of the revolution, down to the epoch when the work was publiſhed.

The States-General, conſiſting of the three orders, the nobility, the clergy, and the tiers-etats, or commonalty, were aſſembled on the 4th of May, 1789. The deputies were all furniſhed with written inſtructions, in which they were poſitively enjoined to make no innovations as to the form of government. Notwithſtanding this, it is well known they framed a conſtitution, by which the government was totally changed, the nobility aboliſhed, and the church rent from that of Rome. Their conſtitution, however, though eſtabliſhed at the expenſe of thouſands of lives, and though one of the moſt ridiculous ſyſtems of government that ever was invented, did not fail to meet with partiſans; and we have heard it extolled in this country as the maſterpiece of human wiſdom.

This firſt Aſſembly, which has been commonly called the Conſtituent Aſſembly, ended its beneficent labours on the 30th of September, 1791, and was immediately ſucceeded by another, which took the name of the Legiſlative Aſſembly. Moſt men

of ſenſe foreſaw that the ſecond Aſſembly would improve upon the plan of deſtruction marked out by the firſt. The clergy, and many men of family and fortune, had been already driven from their homes and poſſeſſions; it remained for the Legiſlative Aſſembly to finiſh the work, by ſeizing on their property and expoſing it to ſale: this they failed not to do. Perſecution and maſſacre increaſed daily; but as the ſmall remains of power left in the hands of the King was ſtill an obſtacle, or rather the monarchy itſelf was an obſtacle, they were determined to get rid of it. On the 10th of Auguſt, 1792, the King was dethroned (his fate is well known), and the daggers of the aſſaſſins were from that moment drawn, never more to be ſheathed, but in the heart of ſome innocent victim. We have already ſeen ſomething of the maſſacres which followed this event at Paris and other places; but theſe are trifles to what was to follow.

On the 21ſt of September, 1792, the third Aſſembly, generally called the National Convention, opened their ſeſſions; and, though every individual member had repeatedly taken an oath to maintain the authority of the King, they at once declared France to be a republic.

After the murder of the King, this Convention declared war againſt a great part of the powers of Europe; and in order to be in a ſituation to make head againſt their enemies, ſeized on all the precious metals in the country, or rather they enacted ſuch laws as obliged the poor oppreſſed people to bring it to their treaſury, and receive in exchange a vile and worthleſs paper money. The churches were inſtantly pillaged, and no perſon dared appear with a watch, or any other article in gold or ſilver.

The violation of property was only a part of their plan. The hearts of the lower orders of the people were to be hardened; they were to be rendered brutal;

tal; all fear of an hereafter was to be rooted from their ſouls, before they could be fit inſtruments in the hands of this helliſh Aſſembly. With this object in view, they declared our bleſſed Lord and Redeemer to be an impoſtor, forbade the acknowledgment of him, and the exerciſe of his worſhip. The churches were turned into priſons, ſtables, &c. and over the gateways of the burial-grounds was written: "This is the place of *eternal ſleep*."—Never, ſurely, was there a better plan for tranſforming a civilized people into a horde of cut-throats. It ſucceeded completely. The blood now flowed at Paris in an unceaſing ſtream. A permanent tribunal was eſtabliſhed, whoſe only buſineſs was to condemn, and certify to the Convention that the executions went on according to the liſts ſent from its Committees.

Beſides legions of executioners, there were others of aſſaſſins. The command of theſe latter was given to thoſe members of the Convention who were ſent into the different parts of the country. Terror preceded theſe harbingers of death, and their footſteps were marked with blood. The ſword, the fire, and the water, all became inſtruments of deſtruction.

During this murdering time, which has juſtly aſſumed the name of the *reign of terror*, the leaders of ſeveral factions of the revolutioniſts themſelves received their reward on a ſcaffold, and, among others, Robeſpierre and his accomplices. When theſe men fell, the Convention, according to its uſual cuſtom, aſcribed all the cruelties committed during ſome time before their death, to them alone; and the people, always eager for blood, now demanded the heads of thoſe whom they had aſſiſted in the murder of their countrymen. By ſacrificing theſe its inſtruments, the Convention ſaw a fair opportunity for removing the infamy from itſelf, and of perpetuating its power. In conſequence, many of them were tried and executed

cuted, and, among others, Carrier (a member of the Convention), who had been ſtationed at Nantz, with the members of the Revolutionary Committee of that unfortunate town. From the trial of theſe men it is that I have ſelected the facts which are to compoſe this chapter. The trial was before the tribunal at Paris, to which place the accuſed were carried from Nantz.

It has been repeatedly aſſerted by thoſe who ſeem to have more attachment to the cauſe of the French than to that of truth, that the barbarities committed in that country have been by the hands of foreigners. Such a ſtory is impoſſible, and even ridiculous; but, however, it has induced me to inſert here a liſt of the barbarous wretches who were ſo long the ſcourge of the city of Nantz, from which it will appear that they were all Frenchmen born and bred. This is an act of juſtice due to other nations.

Members of the Convention on Miſſion at Nantz.

Carrier, *born in Gaſcony.*

Members of the Revolutionary Committee at Nantz.

Goulin
Chaux
Grand-Maiſon
Bachelier
Perrochaux
Mainguet
Naud
Gallen
Duraſſier
} *Born at Nantz.*

Leveque, *born at Mayenne.*
Bolognie, *born at Paris.*
Battalié, *born at Charitié-ſur-Loire.*
Joly, *born at Angerville-la-Martel.*
Pinard, *born at Chriſtople-Dubois.*

Carrier was the great mover, the aſſaſſin-general; the Committee were his agents. Some of them were always

always aſſembled in their hall, to give directions to the under-murderers, while the others took repoſe, or were diſpatched on important expeditions, ſuch as the ſhooting or drowning of hundreds at a time. They ſtood in need, however, of ſubaltern cut-throats, more determined and bloody than the people in general; and therefore they raiſed a company, who took the title of the Company of Marat, compoſed of the vileſt wretches that were to be found. Theſe being aſſembled together, took the following oath before their employers.

Vol. iv. *Page* 203.—"I ſwear to purſue unto death, all *royaliſts*, *fanatics* (Chriſtians*), *gentlemen* (the French word is *muſcadin*, which means a *gentleman*, or *well-dreſſed man)*, and *moderates* (moderate people), under whatever colour, maſk, or form, they may appear.

"I ſwear to ſpare neither *parents* nor *relations*; to ſacrifice my perſonal intereſts, and even friendſhip itſelf; and to acknowledge for parents, brothers, and friends, nobody but the patriots, the ardent defenders of the republic."

Pity with me, reader, the poor unhappy people that were to become the prey of a ſet of blood-hounds like theſe. Pity the aged parents, and the helpleſs babes, that were to bleed beneath their mercileſs ſabres. If you are not endowed with uncommon fortitude, I could almoſt adviſe you to advance no further; fifty times has the pen dropped from my trembling hand: Oh! how I pity the hiſtorian that is to hand theſe bloody deeds down to our ſhuddering and indignant poſterity.

Vol. i. *Page* 66.—*Tronjolly*, a witneſs, informs the tribunal, that the Company of Marat was at firſt compoſed of ſixty perſons; that Goulin openly propoſed that none but the moſt infamous villains ſhould be admitted into it; and, at each nomination,

* *Fanatic* is the name now given to all who remain attached to the Chriſtian religion.

cried

cried out, "Is there no greater ſcoundrel to be found?"

On the 24th of October, ſays the witneſs, I heard Goulin and his colleagues ſay, that they were going to give a great example; that the priſoners ſhould be all ſhot. I atteſt that this ſcene was ſtill more horrible than that of the 22d and 23d of September. The Company of Marat were carouſing round a table, and at the ſame time it was deliberated whether the priſoners ſhould not be maſſacred by hundreds. In this deliberation, Goulin was for indiſcriminate death: and thus were the priſoners, without ever being interrogated or heard, condemned to die. There exiſted no proofs of guilt againſt theſe unfortunate priſoners; they were what were called *ſuſpected perſons:* the felons, and all *real* criminals, were ſet at liberty.

Carrier, in quality of a member of the Convention, had placed a vile wretch at Painbœuf, named Foucault, to whom he gave an abſolute power of life and death.

Vol. i. *Page* 68—Old men, women with child, and children, were drowned without diſtinction. They were put on board of lighters, which were railed round to keep the priſoners from jumping overboard if they ſhould happen to diſengage themſelves. There were plugs made in the bottom, or ſides, which being pulled out, the lighter ſunk, and all in it were drowned. Theſe expeditions were firſt carried on by night, but the ſun ſoon beheld the murderous work. At firſt the priſoners were drowned in their clothes; this, however, appeared too merciful; to expoſe the two ſexes naked before each other was a pleaſure that the ruffians could not forego.

I muſt now, ſays the witneſs, ſpeak of a new ſort of cruelty. The young men and women were picked out from among the maſs of ſufferers, ſtripped naked, and tied together face to face. After being kept in this

this ſituation about an hour, they were put into an open lighter; and after receiving ſeveral blows on the ſkull with the but of a muſket, thrown into the water. Theſe were called *republican marriages*.

Vol. i. *Page* 72.—On the 26th of October, Carrier, the member of the Convention, ordered me (the witneſs was a judge of ſome ſort) to guillotine indiſcriminately all the Vendéans who came to give themſelves up. I refuſed, but the Repreſentative of the People promiſed that his prey ſhould not eſcape him thus. In ſhort, on the 29th, he had guillotined twenty-ſeven Vendéans, among whom were children of thirteen, fourteen, and fifteen years of age, and ſeven young women, the oldeſt of which was not above twenty-nine. On the ſame day twenty other perſons were executed without trial.

Vol. i. *Page* 76.—Carrier, the bloodieſt of the bloody, harangued his agents ſword in hand; he ordered a woman to be ſhot at her window, merely becauſe ſhe looked at him; he choſe from among the female priſoners, thoſe whom he thought worthy of his foul embraces; and, after being ſatiated with their charms, ſent them to the guillotine.

Obſerve well, reader, that this was a *member of the National Convention!—a Repreſentative of the People! a Lawgiver!*

Vol. iv. *Page* 155.—I think it neceſſary to bring here a depoſition or two from the third and fourth volumes of the trial, as they will ſhow at once the pretended and real motives of the member of the Convention and his Committee.

Jomard, a witneſs, declares, that when the generale was beat at Nantz, and the ſeizure of *ſuſpected perſons* began, nobody believed any thing of a conſpiracy againſt the Republic. As a clear proof of this, adds *Jomard*, Richard, one of the agents of the Revolutionary Committee, wrote to his friend Creſpin,

Creſpin, telling him that he had left the Company of Marat without arms; but that means were found out to arm the patriots and diſarm the *ſuſpected*.—The generale, adds Richard, is now beating; but do not frighten yourſelf; I will tell you the reaſon *of this at your return.*

Vol. iii. *Page* 58.—*Latour*, a witneſs, ſays, I was ſick; Dulny, who was my doctor, informed me that Gaudet, public accuſer, had let him into an important ſecret; which was, that Carrier, and the Revolutionary Committee, not knowing how to ſqueeze the rich, had fallen upon a plan to impriſon them, while they ſeized on their effects. In order to have a pretext for doing this, ſaid Gaudet, we ſhall give out that there exiſts a conſpiracy againſt the Republic. I am to make the generale beat early in the morning. The ſans-culottes *, informed beforehand, are to parade at their different poſts; the rich and the timid will, according to cuſtom, remain in their houſes; to theſe houſes the ſans-culottes are to repair, pillage all they have, and convey them to priſon.

Notwithſtanding my illneſs, I had no inclination to be found at home; I therefore begged the Doctor to give me notice when the affair was to take place, which he promiſed to do. In three days after, he informed me that the generale would beat the next morning. In ſpite of my ſickneſs, I went to my poſt. We were all the day under arms, and a great number of rich people were pillaged and impriſoned, ſome guillotined.

I atteſt, adds the witneſs, that there was not the leaſt appearance of any conſpiracy. All was a

* This degrading term, which is become the glory of modern patriots, literally means, *men without breeches*; but it was ever uſed by the French to deſignate vile, raſcally people, the dregs of ſociety; and as ſuch we ought now to underſtand it.

dead

dead calm; terror and conſternation alone reigned in the city. More than three thouſand victims to luſt and avarice were this day lodged in loathſome dungeons, from whence they were never to be releaſed, but to be led to ſlaughter.

I ſhall now inſert an article or two that will give the reader an idea of the manner of proceeding of theſe ſans-culottes.

Vol. iv. *Page* 157.—One of the members of the Revolutionary Committee, with a company of armed ruffians, went to the houſe of one Careil. They firſt examined all the papers, took 5000 livres in paper money, and 12 louis d'ors. They returned again in the evening, ſays the witneſs, who it ſeems was miſtreſs of the houſe; we, at firſt, took them for common thieves, and *therefore our alarm was not ſo great*; but to our ſorrow, we were ſoon convinced by the voice of Pinard, that they were the patriots of the Revolutionary Committee. Our family was compoſed of women and one old man. There were myſelf, four ſiſters-in-law, formerly nuns, two old relations above eighty years of age, and my huſband. The houſe and yard were ſtripped of every thing, and the ruffians were talking of ſetting fire to the buildings. One of my ſiſters made ſhift to preſerve 800 livres; ſhe offered them theſe to ſave the houſe; they accept the conditions, receive the money, and then burn the houſe to the ground.

Our perſons were now all that remained to be diſpoſed of. There was a one-horſe chair; but which was too good for any of us: it was faſtened to the tail of a cart into which we were put (my huſband, an old and infirm man, being obliged to walk in the rear), and thus were dragged, preceded by our plundered property, to that gang of cut-throats called the Revolutionary Committee. Here our complaints were in a moment ſtifled. Pinard ſaid, that his or-

ders were to burn all, and kill all. The Committee were aſtoniſhed and offended at his clemency, and reprimanded him ſeverely for not having murdered us according to his orders.

I, my ſiſters, and our poor old relations, were ſent to one priſon, and my huſband to another. My huſband died, and we are only left alive to weep and ſtarve.

It is well worth the reader's while to hear what this Pinard ſaid in his defence on this head.

Vol. iv. *Page* 162.—We acted, ſays he, by the order of the Repreſentative of the People Carrier. When I went, at my return, to carry him the church-plate that I had taken from the nuns, he would inſiſt upon my drinking out of the chalice (or ſacramental cup), and aſked me why I had not killed all the damned bitches.

I ſhall here obſerve once for all, that theſe volumes contain a ſeries of robberies of this ſort. Sometimes the plunder was divided among the plunderers, ſometimes it was delivered to Carrier, and at others it was depoſited with the Revolutionary Committee. Theſe latter impoſed immenſe taxes, or rather contributions, on the people, under pretence of aſſiſting the ſans-culottes, but which were applied to their own uſes. It is juſt to obſerve alſo, that the tribunal at Paris, before which they were brought to anſwer for their crimes, appears to have ſhown much more anxiety about the gold and ſilver, than about the lives of the murdered perſons.

Vol. v. *Page* 15.—*Mariotte*, a witneſs, informs the tribunal that he was detached on a party to ſeven miles diſtance from Nantz. The party, ſays the witneſs, went into the neighbourhood of the foreſt of Rincé, and took up their quarters in a houſe occupied by Mrs. Chauvette. Five days after our arrival, came Pinard, about midnight, and told us that we were in the houſe of an ariſtocrat. He bragged of

having that evening killed ſix women, and ſaid that Chauvette ſhould make the ſeventh. He threatened her, and, to add to her torment, told her to comfort herſelf, for that her child ſhould die firſt. It is Pinard, adds he, that now ſpeaks to you: Pinard, that carries on the war againſt the female ſex. I drew my ſword, continues the witneſs, and told Pinard that he ſhould paſs over my dead body to come at the woman.

Commerais, who was another of this party, informs the tribunal, that Pinard being thus ſtopped, Aubinet, one of his companions, ſaid, Stand aſide, while I cut open the guts of that bitch. He did not ſucceed, however, adds this witneſs. Now Marieuil came up, and ſwore he would have her life; but finding us in his way, he ſaid, You look like a good b—ger enough; I have a word to ſay in your ear. We only want, ſays he, to know where ſhe has hidden 60,000 livres belonging to a gentleman in the neighbourhood. I anſwered, Give me your word not to hurt the woman nor her child, and I will bring her forth. He promiſed, and I brought them out. The woman, ſeeing that ſhe was conducted to a ſort of cellar, cried out, I know I am brought here to be murdered, like the women whoſe throats were cut in this place yeſterday. All the favour I aſk, ſaid ſhe, is, that you will kill me before you kill my child. She was now queſtioned about the money; but ſhe continued her proteſtations of knowing nothing of it. Pinard and Aubinet prepared again to aſſaſſinate her; but they did not ſucceed for this time.

Vol. v. *Page* 16.—The ſame witneſs relates another adventure. When we were going hence, ſays he, towards the foreſt of Rincé, we heard a man in a little wood, crying for help. We found Pinard and two other horſemen, each having a piece of linen under his arm. We left them, and ſoon after ſaw two poor peaſants running away. In going along among the bruſhwood, ſays the witneſs, I heard ſomething ruſtle

almoſt under my feet: I knocked the buſhes aſide with my muſket:—what ſhould it be but two children? I gave one of them, who was ſeven years old, into the care of Cedré, and kept the other, of five years old, myſelf. They both cried bitterly. Their cries brought to us two women, their mothers, who were alſo hid among the buſhes; they threw themſelves upon their knees, and beſought us not to kill their children. In quitting the wood, Pinard came up with us: he had ſeveral women, whom I ſaw him chop down, and murder with his ſabre. What, ſays he to me, are you going to do with thoſe two children? Stand away, ſays he, till I blow out their brains. I oppoſed him, and while we were in diſpute, two volunteers brought an old man, ſtone-blind. This we now found was the grandfather of the children. Pray, ſaid the poor old man, take my life, and preſerve my little darlings. I told him that we would take care of them; he wept, and ſqueezed my hand. This unfortunate old man, adds the witneſs, was murdered as well as the women.

Pinard quitted the high road in returning, for no other purpoſe but that of murdering. He and his companions killed all they came at, men, women, and children, of all ages. To juſtify his barbarity, he produced the decree that ordered him to ſpare neither ſex nor age.

My reader will recollect that the National Convention of France had aboliſhed *negro ſlavery*; and he will alſo recollect, that the *humanity* of this meaſure has been much applauded by thoſe who have not penetration enough to ſee their motives in ſo doing.

We ſhall now ſee what advantage this liberty procured to the unfortunate country-people round Nantz. This city, from its commercial relations with the Weſt India iſlands, always contained a

number of blacks who came to wait on their maſters, &c. As ſoon as the decree aboliſhing negro ſlavery appeared, theſe people claimed their rights as citizens; and, having no employment, they were taken into the ſervice of the Republic, and placed under the orders of the Revolutionary Committee. A party of theſe citizens was ſent to aſſiſt in the murders round the city, and we ſhall ſee that they were by no means wanting in obedience to their employers.

Vol. v. *Page* 90.—An officer, named Ormes, came, ſays a witneſs, to aſk our aſſiſtance in favour of five pretty women, whom the Company of *Americans* (this was the word which had taken place of that of *negroes*, becauſe the Convention had forbidden any one to call them *negroes*) had reſerved for a purpoſe eaſily to be gueſſed at. A party marched off, and ſoon came to the houſe where the blacks had lodged the women. The poor creatures were crying and groaning; their ſhrieks were to be heard at half a mile diſtance. The party ordered the door to be opened, which was at laſt done. They then demanded the women; No, replied the blacks, they are now *our ſlaves*; we have earned them dear enough, and you ſhall tear them away limb by limb if you have them. We are told by theſe men, that, *thanks to the ſalutary decrees of the Convention*, the French empire contained *no ſlaves*. The brutality of the blacks would not permit them to liſten to the voice of reaſon; they prepared for the *defence of their prey*, when the party, always guided by *prudence*, *preferred retiring*, *to avoid ſlaughter*.

Two days after, continues the witneſs, the *Americans*, ſatiated with their captives, left them. One of theſe women, the handſomeſt in the eyes of the blacks, had been obliged to endure the approaches of more than a hundred of them. She was fallen

into a kind of ſtupor, and was unable to walk or ſtand. The whole five were ſhot ſoon after.

I do not know which is moſt entitled to our deteſtation here, the brutal negroes, or the puſillanimous, raſcally Frenchmen, who were the witneſſes of their horrid deeds. *Prudence* taught theſe poltroons to retire, when they ſaw five of their lovely countrywomen expoſed to the nauſeous embraces of a ſet of filthy, mercileſs monſters! They ſaw them bathed in tears, heard their ſupplicating cries, were ſhocked at a ſight, the very idea of which rouſes all the feelings of manhood; but *Prudence* taught them to retire!—Savage villains! *Prudence* never taught you to retire from the drownings and cries of poor defenceleſs innocent prieſts, and women and children! It was not till the blacks prepared to *defend their prey*, that *Prudence* taught you to retire!

Some of the women, taken in the country, were ſuffered to die, or rather to be murdered, in a leſs ſhocking way.

Vol. v. *Page* 35.—*Nantz*, 5 *Ventoſe, ſecond year of the French Republic.* Citizen *Malé* is hereby ordered to conduct the forty women, under his *care*, to the top of the cliff Pierre Moine, and there throw them head foremoſt into the ſea.

(Signed) FOUCAULT.

We now come to the depoſition of *George Thomas*, a health officer, who is one among the few, even of the witneſſes, that appears to have preſerved ſome remains of humanity. He tells ſuch a tale of woe as I hope, and am perſuaded, the reader's heart will with difficulty ſupport.

Vol. ii. *Page* 147.—The revolutionary hoſpital, ſays the witneſs, was totally unprovided with every neceſſary. The jail fever made terrible ravages in all the houſes of detention; ſeventy-five perſons, or thereabout, died daily in this hoſpital. There was

nothing but rotten mattraſſes: on each of them more than fifty priſoners had breathed their laſt.

I went to Chaux, one of the Committee, to aſk for relief for the unhappy wretches that remained here. We cannot do any thing, ſaid Chaux; but if you will, you may contribute to the cauſe of *humanity* by a way that I will point out to you. That raſcal Phillippes has 200,000 livres in his clutches, which we cannot come at. Now, if you will accuſe him in form, and ſupport your accuſation by witneſſes that I will engage to furniſh you with, I will grant you, out of the ſum, all that you want for the revolutionary hoſpital. At the very mention of *humanity* from Chaux I was aſtounded: the latter part of his propoſal, however, brought me back to my man. I rejected it with the indignation that it merited.

I atteſt, that the Revolutionary Committee of Nantz ſeized and impriſoned almoſt all thoſe who were eſteemed rich, men of talents, virtue, and humanity.

I accuſe this Committee of having ordered, to my knowledge, the ſhooting or drowning of between four and five hundred children, the oldeſt of which were not more than fourteen years of age.

Minguet, one of the Committee, had given me an order to chooſe two from among the children, whom I intended to ſave from death, and bring up. I choſe one of eleven years old, and another of fourteen. The next day I went to the priſon called the *Entrepot*, with ſeveral of my friends, whom I had prevailed on to aſk for ſome of theſe children. When we came, we found the poor little creatures ſtood no longer in need of our interpoſition. They were all drowned. I atteſt, that I ſaw in this priſon, but the evening before, more than four hundred.

Having received an order from the military commiſſioners to go to the *Entrepot*, to certify as to the pregnancy of a great number of women, I found, in the entering this horrible ſlaughter-houſe, a great quantity of dead bodies, thrown here and there. I ſaw ſeveral infants, ſome yet palpitating, and others drowned in tubs of human excrement. I hurried along through this ſcene of horror. My aſpect frightened the women: they had been accuſtomed to ſee none but their butchers. I encouraged them; ſpoke to them the language of humanity. I found that thirty of them were with child; ſeveral of them ſeven or eight months. Some few days after I went again to ſee theſe unhappy creatures, whoſe ſituation rendered them objects of compaſſion and tenderneſs; but—(adds the witneſs with a faltering voice), ſhall I tell you, they had been moſt inhumanly murdered.

The further I advanced, continues the witneſs, the more was my heart appalled. There were eight hundred women, and as many children, confined in the *Entrepot* and in the *Mariliere*. There were neither beds, ſtraw, nor neceſſary veſſels. The priſoners were in want of every thing. Doctor Rollin and myſelf ſaw five children expire in leſs than four minutes. They received no kind of nouriſhment.—We aſked the women in the neighbourhood, if they could not lend them ſome aſſiſtance. What would you have us do? ſaid they; Grand-Maiſon arreſts every one that attempts to ſuccour them.

Vol. ii. *Page* 156.—The ſame witneſs ſays, I accuſe the Committee in general of the murder of ſeven priſoners, whom, for want of time to examine them, they had hewn down with ſabres under the window of their hall.

The witneſs adds, Carrier and the Committee, as well as their under-murderers, uſed to turn the drownings into jeſts: they called them *immerſions*, *national*

national baptiſms, *vertical tranſportations*, *bathings*, &c. I entered, ſays he, one day, a public-houſe oppoſite the Bouffay, where I ſaw a waterman, named *Perdreau*. He aſked me for a pinch of ſnuff: for, ſays the ruffian, I have richly earned it; I have juſt helped to diſpatch ſeven or eight hundred. How, ſays I, do you manage to make away with them ſo faſt? Nothing ſo eaſy, replied he; when I have a bathing-match, I ſtrip them naked, two men with their bayonets puſh them, tied two and two, into my boat, whence they go ſouſe into the water, with a broken ſkull.

Vol. ii. *Page* 151.—*Vaujois*, a witneſs, ſays; I wrote ten times to the adminiſtrators of the diſtrict, and went often to the Revolutionary Committee, to requeſt that ſomething ſhould be done for the poor children in priſon; but could obtain nothing. At laſt I ventured to ſpeak to Carrier, who replied, in a paſſion, You are a counter-revolutioniſt: no pity: they are young vipers, that muſt be deſtroyed. —If I had acted of myſelf, ſays the witneſs, I ſhould have ſhared their fate.

One day, in entering the *Entrepot*, a citizen of Nantz ſaw a great heap of corpſes: they were all of children; many were ſtill palpitating and ſtruggling with death. The man looked at them for ſome time, ſaw a child move its arm, he ſeized it, ran home with it, and had the good luck to ſave it from death, and its more terrible miniſters.

Here *Thomas* is again queſtioned, and he atteſts, that the Revolutionary Committee iſſued an order, commanding all thoſe who had taken children from the priſons, to carry them back again; and this, adds the witneſs, for the pure pleaſure of having them murdered.

Vol. iv. *Page* 245.—*Coſſirant*, a witneſs, depoſes that it was propoſed to ſhoot ſome of the priſoners *en*

maſſe * ; but that the propoſal was rejected. However, ſays he, as I was returning home one evening, I met Ramor, who told me that the ſhooting was at that moment going on. As I heard no noiſe, I could not believe him ; but I was not ſuffered to remain long in doubt. A fellow came up to me, covered with blood : That is the way we knock them off, my boy, ſays he. Seven hundred had been ſhot that afternoon.

Vol. iv. *Page* 256.—*Debourges*, a witneſs, ſays, I have ſeen, during ſix days, nothing but drownings, guillotinings, and ſhootings. Being once on guard, I commanded a detachment that conducted the fourth *maſſe* of women to be ſhot at Gigan. When I arrived, I found the dead bodies of ſeventy-five women already ſtretched on the ſpot. They were quite naked. I was informed that they were girls from fifteen to eighteen years of age. When they had the misfortune not to fall dead after the ſhot, they were diſpatched with ſabres.

Vol. ii. *Page* 244.—*Naud*, one of the accuſed, ſays, I ſaw a red headed General, named Hector, at the head of a detachment, conducting priſoners to the meadow of the Mauves. Caſtrie and I followed him. When we came, they were preparing to fire ; but we made ſhift to ſave a few of the children.

Vol. i. *Page* 27.—*Labenette*, a witneſs, informs the tribunal, that the Revolutionary Committee ordered to be ſtuck on all the walls of the city, a decree, forbidding all fathers, mothers, huſbands, wives, children, relations, or friends, to *ſolicit* the pardon of any priſoner whatever.

---

* The French expreſſion is preſerved here. It is to be hoped that it will never be adopted in the language of any other country. Its meaning is, *in multitudes*.

I was

I was alſo witneſs of the drowning of ninety prieſts, two of whom, who were decrepit old men, by ſome accident or other, eſcaped, but were retaken and murdered. Indeed, adds this witneſs, I have been an eye-witneſs of ſeveral drownings of men, women with child, girls, boys, infants, indiſcriminately. I have alſo ſeen ſome of all theſe deſcriptions ſhot in the public ſquare, and at other places. The national guard of the city was employed during ſix weeks in filling up the ditches, into which the maſſacred perſons were thrown. I was doctor to one of the priſons, and was like to be diſplaced, becauſe I was too humane.

Vol. i. *Page* 60.—Carrier ſent for the Preſident of the Military Commiſſion. It is you, then, ſays he, Mr. ſon of a bitch, that has dared to give orders contrary to mine. Mind; if you have not *emptied* the *Entrepot* in two hours, I will have your head, and the heads of all the Commiſſion.—It is not neceſſary to add, that he was obeyed.

Vol. i. *Page* 103.—*Tronjolly*, a witneſs, ſays, that Chaux expreſſed his diſapprobation of the law of the 14th of September. It is a great pity, ſaid he, it ever was made; without that, we would have reduced the inhabitants of Nantz to a handful.—Carrier was conſulted, adds this witneſs, with reſpect to receiving money to ſave the lives of the rich; but the merciful Repreſentative of the People anſwered —No compoſitions; the guillotine; the guillotine; and take their money afterward.—Three women, too charming certainly, ſince they attracted the deſires of the ferocious Carrier, had the misfortune to be choſen for the tiger's pleaſures. He firſt ſacrificed them to his brutal luſt, and then ſent them to augment the *maſſe* of a maſſacre.

Vol. ii. *Page* 175.—The widow *Dumey*, a witneſs, ſays, that ſhe is the widow of the late keeper of the *Entrepot*; that ſhe ſaw fifty prieſts brought there, and

and robbed of all their money and effects; and that they were afterwards drowned, with ſome women and little children. She alſo adds, twenty-four men and four women were taken out one day. A child of fourteen years was tied with others to be drowned; his cries for his papa were enough to pierce the heart of a tiger; Lambertye tied him, however, and drowned him with the reſt.

Fouquet, the companion of Lambertye, ſaid on this occaſion, that he had already helped to diſpatch nine thouſand, and that if they would but let him alone for twenty-four hours, he would ſweep all the priſons of Nantz.

Vol. ii. *Page* 186.—*Lacaille*, keeper of another priſon called the *Bouffay*, gives a circumſtantial account of one of the drownings.

The horrid night, ſays the witneſs, of the 23d of October, two ſoldiers of the Company of Marat came to the *Bouffay*, each with a bundle of cords. About nine o'clock, they told me there were one hundred and fifty-five priſoners, whom they were to transfer to Belle-Iſle, to work at a fortreſs. About an hour after arrived thirty or forty more of theſe ſoldiers. An order from the Committee was produced for the delivery of one hundred and fifty-five of my priſoners. I obſerved to them, that ſeveral of the priſoners on the liſt were now at liberty, or in the hoſpitals.

They now ſat down to table, and, after having ſupped and drank heartily, they brought out their cords, and diverted themſelves awhile in tying each other, as they intended to tie the priſoners. I then conducted them to the rooms where the priſoners were lodged. They inſtantly fall to work, tying the poor trembling wretches two and two.

Grand-Maiſon now entered the court-yard, and hollowed out to them to diſpatch. Goulin came ſtamping and ſwearing, becauſe the number on the liſt

liſt could not be completed. There were ſo many ſick and dead, that they could not well be made up. I ſent you fifteen this evening, ſays Goulin; what have you done with them? I told him they were up ſtairs. Down with them, ſays he. I obeyed, and they were tied, like the reſt. Inſtead of one hundred and fifty-five, Goulin at laſt conſented to take one hundred and twenty-nine; but this number not being complete, the equitable and tender-hearted Goulin orders the remainder to be taken from the priſoners indiſcriminately; and when this was done, he marches off at the head of the aſſaſſins to conduct them to the river, where they were all drowned.

Vol. ii. *Page* 204.—The widow *Mallet*, who had firſt been robbed of her property, and then impriſoned, gives an account of the manner in which ſhe and her companions in captivity were treated.

I complained, ſays this poor woman, to Perrocheaux of a violent ſore throat. That is good, ſaid he; the guillotine will cure you of that.

One day Jolly aſked if I was not the widow Mallet, and giving me a look, that makes me tremble even now, Aye, ſays he, ſhe ſhall drink out of the great cup.

In the houſe where we were confined, there was a great number of beautiful pictures. Some men were ſent one day by the Committee to tear them to pieces, which they did, leaving only one which repreſented *Death*, and jeering with ſavage irony, Contemplate that image, ſaid they, to cheer your hearts.

We were in want of every neceſſary. Seven hundred of us were confined in this houſe, which, even as a priſon, was too ſmall for two hundred. Forty were crammed into one little chamber. During ſix or ſeven months we had no infirmary, or rather, each apartment was one. The ſick and dead

dead were often extended on the floor among the living. How many have I ſeen ſtruggling in the pangs of death by my ſide!

Grand-Maiſon told me one day of an old quarrel: Times are altered, ſays he; now I have you under my clutches.

Duraſſier came one day drunk, and began to make out a liſt for execution. His oaths and imprecations made us tremble; I was on the fatal liſt, and I know not how I have eſcaped.

My old ſervant went to ſolicit for my removal, repreſenting me as dangerouſly ill. Perrocheaux ſaid to her, Let her die, you ſilly bitch, and then we ſhall have her houſe, and you will fare better with us than with her.

Vol. ii. *Page* 215.—*Brejot*, a witneſs, ſays, There were ſome women going to be ſhot; one of them had a child of eleven months old at her breaſt, which the aſſaſſins would have ſhot with its mother, had not a ſoldier ſnatched it from her arms. The babe was carried by a woman to Gourlay, a ſurgeon, who had the compaſſion to take care of it.

Vol. ii. *Page* 217.—*Fournies*, a witneſs, ſays, that there were at one time, to his knowledge, ninety-ſix prieſts drowned in the Loire. Adds he, four of them got on board a Dutch ſloop lying in the river; but were retaken and drowned the next day. Foucault, in boaſting of the ſecond drowning of theſe prieſts, ſhowed, in the company where I was, a pair of ſhoes he then wore, which he had taken from the feet of one of them.

Vol. ii. *Page* 220.—*Jane Lallies*, a young woman, confined on the general accuſation of being an ariſtocrat, informs the tribunal, that ſhe was made cook in the priſon. One night, ſays ſhe, a number of the Company of Marat came to the priſon. One Girardeau conducted the troop. Come, my lads, ſays he, I muſt go and ſee my birds in the

the cage. Ducon, ſeeing ſome of the priſoners weep, What the devil do you howl for? ſays he: we want proviſions here, and we are going to ſend you off to get us ſome, that is all.

Creſpin ſaid to me, in giving me ſeveral blows with his naked ſword, March, bitch, light us along: we are maſters now: your turn will ſoon come, when there is no better game.

Come, come, my little ſinging birds, ſaid Jolly; out of your neſts, and make up your packets, and above all do not forget your pocket-books; that is the main point; no cheating the nation. Ducon ſaid aſide to Duraffier, Are not they finely bit? Finding they did not prepare themſelves quick enough, he adds, Come, come, time to dreſs them, time to ſhoot them, time to knock their brains out—I think that is plenty of time for them.

Duraffier kept bawling out, Quick, b—gers, march. To a ſick man, who walked with a ſtick, he ſaid, You want no ſtick; march like the reſt, b—gers; you ſhall ſoon have a ſtick with a devil to you.

Ducon, as he went away, ſaid to the keeper, Good by for this time; we ſhall come again ſoon to eaſe you of the reſt: I think we have a pretty ſmart haul for once.—Theſe poor ſouls were all drowned.

Vol. ii. *Page* 222.—*Mrs. Pichot*, living by the water-ſide at Nantz, ſays, that ſhe ſaw the carpenters buſy conſtructing the lighters for drowning the priſoners; and ſoon after, ſays the witneſs, I ſaw brought to be drowned at the Crepuſcule, a great number of women, many of whom had ſucking children in their arms. They ſcreamed and cried moſt piteouſly. Oh! ſaid they, muſt we be put to death without being heard?

Several poor women of the neighbourhood ran and took a child apiece, and ſome two, from them.

Upon

Upon this the poor creatures ſhrieked and tore their hair worſe than before.—Oh! my dear, my love, my darling babe! am I never to ſee your dear face again? Heavens protect my poor dear little love! —Such heart-piercing cries were ſurely never before heard! yet theſe could not ſoften the hell-hounds that conducted them.

Many of theſe women were far advanced with child. All were taken into the boats; a part were immediately diſpatched, and the reſt put on board the Dutch ſloop till the next day.

When the next day arrived, ſays the witneſs, though we were all terror-ſtruck, many had the courage to aſk for a child apiece of thoſe that were left alive: but the hard-hearted villain Fouquet refuſed, pretending his orders were changed; and all that remained on board the ſloop were drowned.

Vol. ii. *Page* 223.—The ſame witneſs ſays, One day I ſaw ſeveral priſoners, brought from the *Entrepot*, depoſited in a lighter with a neck. They were faſtened under hatches, where they were left for forty-eight hours. When the hatches were opened, there were ſixty of them ſtifled. Other priſoners that were now on board were obliged to take out the bodies. Robin ſtood on the deck, with his drawn ſword in his hand, and ſuperintended the work. This done, all the priſoners on board were ſtripped naked, men, women, and children of all ages, from fourſcore to five; their hands were tied behind them, and they were thrown into the river.

Here the Judge, if we ought to call a ſans-culotte ruffian a Judge, aſked the witneſs if this drowning was performed by day or by night. By open day, anſwers the witneſs. She adds, I obſerved that the drowners became very familiar with the prettieſt of the women; and ſome few of them were ſaved, if it can be called ſaving, to endure the more than infernal embraces of theſe monſters.

Vol.

Vol. ii. *Page* 227.—*Delamarre* informs the tribunal, that there was a heap formed of the bodies of the women who had been ſhot, and that the ſoldiers, laughing, called this horrible ſpectacle the *mountain*, alluding to the Mountain of the National Convention.

Vol. ii. *Page* 231.—Foucault having ſaid one day to Bachelier, that he had two cargoes to diſpatch that night, Bachelier flings his arms round his neck, ſaying, You are a brave fellow, the beſt revolutioniſt I know among them all.

This ſame Foucault fired at his father with a piſtol; and was looked upon as the inventor of the plugged lighters for drowning the priſoners.

Delaſſal, who appears to have been an officer of police, tells the tribunal, that one day he had taken up a woman of bad fame, who lived with Lambertye, one of the chief drowners. He came to my houſe, ſays the witneſs, in a rage, abuſed my wife, and caſting a ferocious look at my children, Poor little b—gers, ſays he, I pity you; to-morrow you will be fatherleſs.

Vol. ii. *Page* 252.—*Coron*, one of the Company of Marat, informs the tribunal, that he had ſeven thouſand five hundred perſons ſhot at the Gigan, and four thouſand he had aſſiſted to drown.

Vol. ii. *Page* 254.—*Sophy Bretonville*, a witneſs, atteſts, that Perrocheaux came ſeveral times to her father's, under pretence of ſpeaking to her mother about the releaſe of her huſband; but that his real buſineſs was to make indecent offers to herſelf. In ſhort, ſays the witneſs, he made me an offer to releaſe my father, if I would ſatisfy his luſtful deſires; but, as I refuſed, Very well, ſaid he at laſt, I ſhall go and do his buſineſs for him in an inſtant.

Vol. ii. *Page* 258.—A houſe was wanted for ſome purpoſe by the Committee. Chaux was told that there was one in the neighbourhood; but that it

was

was occupied by the owner. A pretty ſtory, ſays he; in with the b—ger into priſon, and he will be glad to purchaſe his life at the expenſe of his houſe.

When the horrible ſituation of the priſoners was repreſented to the Committee, Goulin and Chaux replied, So much the better; let them die, it will be ſo much clear gain to the nation.

Vol. ii. *Page* 284.—*Jane Lavigne* informs the tribunal, that one night Carrier came with Phillippe to ſup at her houſe. They were talking, ſays the witneſs, of the meaſures to be purſued. You are a parcel of whining b—gers of judges, ſaid Carrier: you want proofs to guillotine a man; into the river with the b—gers, ſays the Repreſentative of the People, into the river with them; that is the ſhorteſt way.

Vol. iii. *Page* 12.—*Mary Herau* informs the tribunal, that ſhe got admittance one day into a priſon where there were a great many women confined; ſeveral hundreds. I ſaw one amongſt them, adds the witneſs, that was taken in labour: ſhe was crawling with vermin; her lips were blue; death had already ſeized her. To bear the ſtench of this infected abode, I was obliged to have the ſmelling-bottle continually at my noſe.

In conſequence of the permiſſion granted me to chooſe a child out of this priſon, I went to a room where there were three hundred, or thereabouts, all of whom appeared dying or dead. I ſtopped at the door (for the ſtink was ſuch that I durſt advance no further), and called the children to me. Some of the little innocents raiſed their hands, and others their heads: but only ſix were able to get to me. I took one of them, and was alſo allowed to take a poor woman, whoſe ſituation and piteous moans moved me to the ſoul. I gave them an aſylum at my houſe till the iſſuing of the inhuman decree, which obliged me to return them into the clutches of the tiger. When this decree came out, I applied to the wife of Gallon, one of the Committee, begging her

her to intercede with her husband for the preservation of the woman and child I had taken: I will do no such thing, said she; and if you will be advised by a friend, you will not trouble your head about them. They were re-imprisoned, and I never heard of them more.

Vol. iii. *Page* 14.—*Mrs. Laillet* informs the tribunal, that six young ladies, of the name of Lameterye, were sent to the Bouffay. Carrier, says she, sent an order to put them instantly to death. The keeper of the prison commissioned me to communicate to them the fatal tidings. I called them into a room apart, and told them that the Representative of the People had ordered their execution.

The youngest of them gave me this ring (here she showed the ring): they threw themselves on their knees, and called on the name of Jesus Christ. From this posture the ruffians roused to conduct them to the place of death. They were executed, without ever being tried. While they were dispatching, twenty-seven men awaited the fatal stroke at the foot of the guillotine.

It is said, to the *honour* of the executioner, that his remorse for having executed these young ladies was so great, that he died in a few days afterwards.

I attest, adds this witness, that I have seen numbers of naked bodies of women lying by the side of the Loire, thrown up by the tide. I have seen heaps of human bodies gnawed, and partly devoured by the dogs and birds of prey: which latter were continually hovering over the city, and particularly near the water-side. I have seen numbers of carcasses in the bottoms of the lighters, partly covered with water.

Vol. iii. *Page* 23.—*Rénaudot* informs the tribunal, that he saw a number of men conducted to the meadow called the Mauves, and shot. Some

of them who were not killed by the fufils, fays the witneſs, were diſpatched with the ſabre. A cannoneer, named Jacob, came up to me, and ſaid that it was he who had finiſhed thoſe who eſcaped the balls. Their necks, ſays this butcher, were juſt the thing to try my new ſabre.

Vol. iii. *Page* 24.—I accuſe, ſays the ſame witneſs, the Committee, of the murder of three nuns with my children's maid. They were conducted by Jolly to the Committee to take the oath of apoſtacy. Shoot no more, drown no more, ſaid the nuns, and we will even take this horrid oath. This amounted to a refuſal, and the conſequences are too well known.

Vol. iii. *Page* 25.—*Captain Leroux* atteſts, that the murder of the ninety prieſts was a moſt wanton act of cruelty, contrary to the profeſſions of the Committee itſelf; for that they were *only* to be ſent, it was ſaid, into perpetual exile. He ſays he was ordered before the Committee, and threatened with impriſonment for having permitted two of them to get on board his veſſel.

Captain Boullet, one day, in weighing his anchor, ſaw four or five dead bodies raiſed by the cable; and adds, that there were one hundred and thirty women confined at Mirabeau, who diſappeared all at once.

Vol. iii. *Page* 27.—*Foucault*, one of the accuſed, being aſked by the Judge, what was become of the pillage of the prieſts (for, as I have already obſerved, this ſeemed to be the chief object of the trial), Foucault replied, that, having conſulted Carrier on the ſubject, he anſwered, B—ger! who ſhould have it but thoſe that did the work? Foucault declares, that the effects of the prieſts were lodged on board the covered lighter, whence the prieſts had been precipitated into the water; and on board of which Lambertye, the chief in this expedition, gave a great dinner

dinner the next day, coſting forty thouſand livres. From other witneſſes, it appears that Carrier aſſiſted at this repaſt, and that he even propoſed dining on the ſcaffold of the guillotine.

The following traits are well calculated to ſhow what ſort of treatment a people muſt ever expect from the hands of baſe-born villains, when they are ſuffered to ſeize the reins of power.

Vol. iii. *Page* 11.—I had a ſon and daughter, ſays a witneſs named *Puſterle*; Goulin had propoſed a marriage between his ſon and my daughter, and Goulin another between his daughter and my ſon. Neither had my conſent; and to avenge themſelves, when they were in the Committee, they ſeized my wife and daughter, and all my moſt valuable property. The former were dragged to a loathſome priſon; the latter I have never ſince ſeen or heard of.

Vol. iii. *Page* 17.—A friend of Goulin had, as he pretended, been brought to puniſhment by the family of the two young Toinettes. When they were brought before the Committee, he told them of this. But, ſaid they, it could not be us. Goulin, like the wolf in the fable, cried out, If it was not you, it was your father. The two Toinettes were executed.

Vol. iii. *Page* 33.—My ſon-in-law, ſays a witneſs, named Vallé, had been confined for no other ſpecified crime than that of being a *well-dreſſed man* (muſcadin). I went to Carrier and to the Committee to ſolicit his releaſe, before the order was iſſued forbidding all ſolicitations. There ſeemed to be ſome hopes of ſucceeding; but Chaux oppoſed my requeſt, and he alone. It was he who had ordered him to be impriſoned, to be revenged on us, becauſe we refuſed to ſell him a quantity of ſtarch that he had a mind to.

Vol. iii. *Page* 38.—I was at a drowning, ſays

Tabouret, on board a lighter conducted by Affilé. Come on, my lads, said he, to the island of *Topsy-turvy*. Before we got out to the sinking-place, I heard the prisoners make the most terrible lamentations. Save us! oh! save us! cried they; there is yet time! Oh! pray, pray, save us! Some of their hands were untied, and they run them through the railing, crying, Mercy! mercy! It was then that I saw the villain Grand-Maison chop off their hands and arms with his sabre. Ten minutes after, I heard the carpenters, placed in the little boats, hammering at the sides of the lighter; and, directly, down it went to the bottom.

Vol. iii. *Page* 90.—*Trappe.* When the fifty-five priests were drowned, I went to Carrier to ask him what should be done with their money, gold, and silver snuff-boxes, rings, &c. Leave them nothing, says he. Embark these b—gers, and let me hear no more of them, says the Representative of the People.

These priests, says the witness, had a great number of valuable jewels, which were all delivered to Richard. Carrier, upon hearing that the expedition was over, seemed angry; Blast it, says he, I intended to reserve that job for Lambertye.

The widow *Dumey* corroborates the evidence of Trappe, and adds, After the priests were drowned, Lambertye came to me, and pointing his sabre to my breast, Bitch, says he, you shall give me an account of the spoils of those priests.—I attest, says this witness, that Lambertye and Fouquet were the favourites of the Representative of the People.

Vol. iii. *Page* 43.—*Naudiller.* I was one day at Carrier's with Lambertye and several others. Carrier, in pointing to the river, said, We have already ducked two thousand eight hundred of them there. One of the strangers asking what he meant, Yes, says

ſays Carrier, two thouſand eight hundred in the *national bath.*

I myſelf ſaw, ſays the witneſs, while I was at Nantz, which was not long, five hundred men, and two hundred and fifty women, all tied, conducted to the Loire by Lambertye and Fouquet.

Vol. iii. *Page* 50.—One time, ſays *Affilé* (he was one of the drowners), Fouquet ordered me to go to Marie, to beſpeak the two lighters that were wanted for the night, and to engage ſome carpenters. This done, I went and got the cords and the ſtaples to faſten the priſoners at the bottom of the lighter. About nine o'clock, nearly five hundred were put on board. Theſe were pillaged and ſtripped in the lighter, and Fouquet ſwore, if I did not obey his requiſitions, which were always made in the *name of the law*, he would drown me with the reſt.

Four little boats, continues Affilé, attended each lighter. When the plugs were pulled out, the priſoners cried, Mercy! There were ſome on the half-deck with their hands tied only; and theſe, when they ſaw the lighter ſinking, cried, Let us jump into their boats, and drown them with ourſelves. But all that attempted it were hacked down with ſabres.

When the expedition was completed, we went to Thomas's hotel, where the effects of the priſoners had been carried; hence we went to Secher's, where we divided the ſpoil.

The priſoners on their trial, having denied here, that they had given orders for the drownings, ſeveral of their orders were produced and read. It may not be amiſs to inſert two or three of them. They will give the reader a perfect idea of the murderers' ſtyle.

In the name of the Republic. The Revolutionary Committee authorize Citizen Affilé, junior, to require the number of carpenters that he may find neceſſary for the execution of the expedition he is charged

with. This Citizen is required to uſe all the diſpatch in his power, and to give *generous* wages to the workmen, provided they work with all the *zeal* and activity that the *public ſervice* requires.

(Signed) GOULIN,
BACHELIER,
and others.

In the name of the Republic. The Revolutionary Committee authorize Citizen Golas to take as many lighters and ſmall boats as he ſhall judge neceſſary for the execution of the *buſineſs* that the Committee has intruſted to his *zealous care.*

(Signed) NAUD,
BOLOGNIE,
GOULIN,
and others.

In the name of the Republic. Citizen Affilé, junior, is required to pay attention to, and ſee executed, the order given to Citizen Golas: and all watermen and others are required *to aid* and *aſſiſt* in the *public ſervice*, and to obey the requiſition of Citizen Affilé, under pain of being declared *bad citizens* and *ſuſpected perſons.*

(Signed) GRAND-MAISON,
NAUD,
and others.

Vol. iii. *Page* 63.—*Bourdin*, a witneſs, gives an account of ſeveral ſhootings. The laſt that I ſaw, adds he, was of eighty women. They were firſt ſhot, then ſtripped, and left expoſed on the ſpot during three days.

I carried a young lad off from the *Entrepot.* He was thirteen years of age. When the Revolutionary Committee ordered all the children, thus preſerved, to be given up, Jolly, who ſaid he was the judge of all the priſoners, permitted me to keep this boy; but my neighbour Aignes, who could not obtain a like favour, gave up a lad of fourteen years of age, agreeably

agreeably to the order of the Committee, and the next day we ſaw him ſhot.

When the ſhooting *en maſſe* firſt began, the priſoners were ſuffered to retain their clothes till they were dead. As they were conducted to the place of execution, and even after they arrived on the ſpot, the old clothes dealers were ſeen bargaining with the ſoldiers for their clothes. The poor unfortunate creatures had the mortification to ſee their own townſmen and women buying the poor remains of their fortunes on their backs; and the inſtant they fell, the monſters ruſhed in, tearing the new-acquired property from their bodies, yet ſtruggling in the pangs of death. But the revolutionary butchers found that this was but an unproductive ſale: the clothes being ſhot through, ſunk their value; and this circumſtance determined them to ſtrip the priſoners naked before execution.

Vol. iii. *Page* 66.—*Lambert*, another witneſs, informs the tribunal, that he has ſeen the banks of the Loire covered with dead bodies; among which were ſeveral of old men, little children of both ſexes, and an infinite number of women, all naked. One of the women, that I ſaw at one time, had an infant locked in her arms. She had been drowned at the Crepuſcule the day before with about two hundred more.

Vol. iii. *Page* 96.—A witneſs depoſes that ſhe ſaw Lebrun, one of the Company of Marat, jump and dance upon the dead body of a child.

Vol. iii. *Page* 99.—*Lamarie.* I was one morning at breakfaſt with Crucy, Leveque, and Perrocheaux, when the latter told me, they were juſt going to take a young girl out of priſon to put her in keeping for their own *uſe*.

I was one day, ſays the witneſs, at the Committee, to aſk the releaſe of ſome children, and I could not help being ſhocked at the jocular manner in which they proceeded and talked. Chaux ſaid to

me, Here we are, you ſee, up to our eyes among the dead bodies and pretty girls.

The criminals being aſked what they had to ſay concerning their having iſſued certain cruel decrees, anſwered, that they were *fathers of families*, and that if they had diſobeyed Carrier, they feared he might not only deſtroy them, but their wives and children alſo.

Now, then, let us ſee how theſe affectionate, tender-hearted fathers of families behaved towards the wives and children of others.

Vol. iii. *Page* 67.—As they had denied having iſſued the cruel orders for impriſoning the children, the following decrees were produced.

The Revolutionary Committee orders the *benevolent* commiſſaries of the 17th ſection, as well as all others who have priſoners in their houſes of detention, to deliver to nobody any child whatever, except it may be to the officers of the ſhips of the Republic, and even they are to take *none under* ſeventeen years of age.

(Signed) GOULIN,
and others.

The citizen keeper of the *Entrepot* is ordered to give in a liſt of all thoſe, who, in obedience to the order of the Committee, have delivered up the children they had taken from the priſon.

(Signed) CHAUX,
and others.

Citizen Dumey is ordered to give in a liſt of all the perſons, with the ſtreets and numbers of the houſes where they live, who have taken away any of the priſoners. He will be particular in the dwelling of the women, who, in ſpite of the decrees of the Committee, have had the *infamy* to take away ſeven young girls of fifteen or ſixteen years of age.

(Signed) GRAND-MAISON,
and others.

When

When the blood-thirſty villains had thus collected all the unhappy priſoners together, they iſſued the following order.

In the name of the Revolutionary Committee of Nantz. The commandant of the troops is required to furniſh three hundred regulars. One half of this detachment will march to the Bouffay, and taking the priſoners thence, will conduct them, bound two and two, to the priſon of the Eperonniére. The other diviſion will go to Saintes-Caires, and conduct the priſoners from thence to the Eperonniére. Then all theſe priſoners, together with thoſe confined in the priſon of the Eperonniére, are to be taken and ſhot, *without diſtinction of age or ſex*, in the manner that the commanding officer of the detachment may judge moſt *convenient*.

(Signed) GRAND-MAISON,
GOULIN,
MINGUET,
and others.

In this place, it may not be amiſs to let the reader hear what theſe monſters had to ſay in their defence.

Vol. iii. *Page* 35.—*Goulin.* They keep telling us of our terrific meaſures: I maintain that we made nobody tremble but the *miſers*, the *rich*, the *hoarders of proviſions*, the *fanatics*, and the *ariſtocrats*: but as for the true ſans-culottes, they had nothing to fear.

Bachelier (Vol. iii. *Page* 31). *All the rich were ſuſpected perſons.* We were obliged to ſtrike, not only them who *did*, but them who *could do* harm. However, very few patriots were ſacrificed; we aimed principally at the former nobility and clergy; at thoſe who hoarded up proviſions, and all ſuch as poſſeſſed great riches. The true and real ſans-culottes were ſpared.

Vol. iii. *Page* 99.—One day, ſays a witneſs, I begged Bachelier to have mercy on the little children. I pleaded

I pleaded their innocence, and repreſented their infancy, and the injuſtice of puniſhing them for the faults of their parents. Bachelier anſwered coolly, If I did not know you, I ſhould take you for an ariſtocrat. You do not perceive then, that theſe children have ſucked ariſtocratic milk; that the blood that runs in their veins is impure, and incapable of being changed into republican blood? I compare them, added he, to an oil-barrel, which, in ſpite of all the waſhing and ſcrubbing you can give it, will for ever retain its ſtink. It is juſt ſo with theſe children. They will always retain an attachment to the kings and prieſts of their fathers.

Vol. iii. *Page* 104.—*Bachelier* anſwers to this. With reſpect, ſays he, to the children of the ariſtocrats, I own that I ſaid, they were hard to be made good republicans; and that it was much to be feared that the children of fanatics would *one day* reſemble their parents. Renard, mayor of Nantz, who is known for a ſound patriot and a *humane man*, ſaid on this ſubject, that the *cats* eat the *young rats*, and that they were in the right of it; for it was the only way of deſtroying the breed. I am perſuaded, adds Bachelier, that no true republican will blame me for ſaying and thinking like Renard, who was a moſt excellent patriot.

There was, it ſeems, another reaſon for murdering the ariſtocrats; for when the propoſal was made for killing them *en maſſe*, Robin ſaid (vol. iii. page 85), The patriots are *in want of bread*; it is juſt that thoſe ſcoundrels ſhould periſh, and not *eat up our victuals from us*. Kerman oppoſed this; but Robin exclaimed, None of your *moderate* propoſitions here. I ſay, they are a parcel of ariſtocrats that wiſh to overturn the republic, therefore let them die.

Vol. iii. *Page* 106.—*Creſpin*, one of the Company of Marat, informs the tribunal, that he was at a drowning on board the lighter, where the priſoners

ers were faſtened down under boards, nailed from ſide to ſide. They uttered, ſays he, the moſt piteous cries. Some of them put their hands folded in a ſupplicating poſture through the openings between the boards; and I ſaw the members of the Committee chop off thoſe hands and fingers. One of them plunged his ſabre down in among the priſoners, and we heard a man cry out, Oh! the raſcal! he has ſtabbed me! Our ears, adds the witneſs, were now ſtunned with the cry of, Oh! you raſcally brutal ſavages! this is the mercy, this is the humanity of republicans!

One day, continues this witneſs, he ſaw Carrier in a coach at the foot of the guillotine, enjoying the ſpectacle, while about twenty perſons were beheaded. Naud was with me, who went up to Carrier with me, and aſked him, if he did not want a Marat. Yes, b—ger, ſays Carrier. I am your man, then, ſaid Naud.

The new Marat was diſpatched to call the *Judges* to the Repreſentative of the People; and when Philippes ventured to tell him, that, among thoſe whom he had ordered to the guillotine from the Bouffay, there were two children of fourteen years of age, and two others of thirteen, Carrier fell into a violent paſſion: Damned b—gers, ſays he, in what country am I got? *All milk-hearted raſcals alike!*

The following traits will prove that a ferocious cruelty had taken poſſeſſion of the hearts of the young as well as the old.

Vol. iii. *Page* 65.—*Lalloue*, ſays *Naud*, offered himſelf as an expreſs to fetch back the one hundred and thirty-two perſons that were ſent off to Paris. This he ſaid he would do for the pleaſure of ſeeing them drowned.

This Lalloue, continues the witneſs, was a *Judge*, and the companion of the Repreſentative of the People, although but *nineteen* years of age. He had been

been convicted of *theft*, and boaſted of being one of the murderers of the priſoners at Paris, in the month of September, 1792. Ah! ſays he, one day, to one of his companions on the bench, you ſhould have ſeen us at Paris in the month of September. There you would have learned how to knock them off.

Vol. iii. *Page* 111.—*Lecocq*. I ſaw ſeveral men and women chopped down on board a Dutch ſloop that lay in the river. I ſaw a young lad aſſiſting to drown the priſoners at the laſt drowning; particularly one whom he unmercifully ſeized by the leg, dragged to the ſide of the lighter, and kicked overboard.

Vol. iii. *Page* 126.—*Laillet* informs the tribunal, that ſhe ſaw a lad of about ſeventeen or eighteen years of age hew down two priſoners, and hack them with his ſabre, at the priſon of the Bouffay. They were afterwards, adds the witneſs, dragged to the water-ſide.

Vol. iii. *Page* 111.—*Fontbonne* informs the tribunal, that, at the requeſt of Delille, he went to the *Entrepot* to endeavour to ſave an innocent and amiable family of females, the youngeſt of which was about thirteen years of age. Delille went with me. When we came to the priſon, we were conducted to a horrid ſtinking hole under a ſtaircaſe. We aſked for a candle, and after ſome time we got into this ſort of dungeon. Here we found the mother and four daughters lying cloſe to each other upon ſome wet and filthy ſtraw; and round about them there were ſeveral dead women. The youngeſt daughter, whom alone we had obtained permiſſion to take, was covered up in her mother's gown to keep her warm.—When we told the poor mother our errand; No, ſaid ſhe, my child ſhall ſtay and die with myſelf; we have lived, and we will die together. We thought ourſelves juſtified, adds the witneſs, in

uſing

uſing force. When the mother perceived our reſolution, ſhe uttered ſuch dreadful lamentations as are impoſſible to be deſcribed. My child! oh! my dear, darling child! were the laſt words her daughter ever heard from her. The child never recovered the ſtroke; ſhe pined away about eight months, and then died.

Vol. iii. *Page* 113.—The ſame witneſs ſays, I ſaw a number of perſons conducted from the Place of Equality, to be ſhot at the Mauves. There were women and children of all ages amongſt them. My heart could not ſupport this ſpectacle; I ran home, ſaddled my horſe, and rode to the place of execution. When I arrived, the poor creatures were all on their knees, and the ſoldiers were preparing to fire. I ruſhed through them, and had the good fortune to ſave eight of the children, the oldeſt of which was twelve years of age; the reſt were ſhot, with their fathers and mothers.

Vol. iii. *Page* 114.—*Laurency* informs the tribunal, that he ſaw, at one time, three hundred men conducted to the water. They were all naked, and had their hands tied behind them. I ſaw too, adds the witneſs, ſeveral women and girls murdered on board a barge in the river; two of whom, aged about eighteen years, I ſaw a young lad behead with his ſabre, while he ſung the *Carmagnole*.

Vol. iii. *Page* 119.—*Saudrac.* At a great dinner, to which Lambertye, the chief murderer, invited Carrier, I was a witneſs of a moſt ſcandalous ſcene. After the repaſt was over, and while the glaſs went round, Lambertye entertained us with a long and full account of a drowning he had performed the night before, and boaſted of the manner in which he ſabred the poor wretches that attempted to eſcape. All the *convives*, adds the witneſs, honoured his valour with long and repeated burſts of applauſe.

Carrier

Carrier toaſted the *national bath*. This monſter talked of nothing but death and the guillotine.

Another witneſs ſays (vol. iii. page 123), I ſaw Carrier, with his drawn ſword in his hand, threatening to guillotine the firſt perſon who ſhould dare to ſhow the leaſt pity for the priſoners that were conducted to execution.

And another (vol. ii.) ſays, Carrier came one day to look at the lighters that were conſtructing for the drownings, and turning to Foucault, Charmingly commodious indeed! ſays he. Do you hear? added he; pay theſe lads well for their labour.

Vol. iii. *Page* 126.—An old man appeared at the bar. I atteſt, ſays he, that I was ill-treated by the Revolutionary Committee, becauſe I requeſted the releaſe of a young girl who was entirely innocent. The Committee told me that I had no buſineſs to meddle with any ſuch people. My nephew and my ſon-in-law were ſhot for no crime whatever; and, adds the old man, I had the grief to ſee my own children dragged from my houſe to the fatal lighters. One of them who made an attempt to eſcape from the hands of his barbarous executioners, was caught and ſhot.

I dare ſay the reader is ready to weep for this poor diſtreſſed father: but let him reſerve his tears for more worthy objects. This old man was a murderer like the reſt, and his own family had fallen into the pit he had dug for another. Yes, reader, this gray-headed, ferocious old tiger, who complains of the cruelties of others, ends his evidence by accuſing Carrier, even Carrier, of having ſhown an act of mercy!—I accuſe him (ſays the hoary aſſaſſin, page 26) of being *no patriot*, ſince he *did not execute* the wife of Temploire, whom I informed againſt as an emigrant.

Vol. iv. *Page* 148.—*Juget*, a Judge at Nantz, reads, from the regiſter of his tribunal, an order of Carrier

Carrier to ſend thirty-ſix men, twenty women, and four children, to be ſhot, without being heard or tried. This was accordingly done.

Vol. iv. *Page* 148.—*Poupon* depoſes, that he was witneſs of a drowning, when the Company of Marat went and dragged ſick perſons from the hoſpital, in order to make up a lighter-full. Some of theſe perſons, adds the witneſs, could ſcarcely crawl along, and I ſaw theſe murderers beat them moſt cruelly with great ſticks, crying, Along with you, b—gers! march! march! we will give you ſweet air enough now. Others they dragged along by the hair of the head, till they got them on board the lighter. All this time, ſays the witneſs, the conductors of the expedition kept hallooing out, Come, come, my lads, be quick! along with the b—gers! the tide falls apace: there is no time to be loſt.

Vol. iv. *Page* 151.—*Seginel,* one of the Company of Marat, informs the tribunal, that Goulin and Chaux conducted ſome of the Company, one day, to the houſe of Carrier. When we came, ſays this under-cut-throat, into the preſence of the Repreſentative of the People, our conductors told him we were good lads, citizens on whom he might rely. So much the better, ſays Carrier, adding, Depend on it, my boys. if you do your duty like good b—gers, the Republic, which is never ungrateful, will pay you well.

While we were there, ſays the witneſs, Lambertye came, and went into another room with Carrier. Goulin aſked Grand-Maiſon who that man was. He is a ſecond Marat, replied the latter, and is now, without doubt, receiving orders to communicate to us.

Marat.—The name of Marat has been ſo often mentioned, it may not be improper, or out of place, to give the reader here ſome account of that famous, or rather infamous cut-throat.

Before the revolution, he was an obſcure beggarly fellow, that was daily liable to be brought before the Officer of Police, to give an account of the manner in which he got his bread. But, when this grand event took place, when murderers were wanted in every quarter of the country, he began to cut a figure on the ſcene. He publiſhed a gazette, in which he inculcated the neceſſity of lopping off the heads of thouſands at a time, and of watering, as he called it, the tree of liberty with the blood of the ariſtocrats, as the only means of rendering it fruitful.

Theſe, and ſuch-like ſentiments, recommended him to the notice of his countrymen; he obtained their confidence, and was one of the *organizers* (to uſe a French term) of the maſſacres of the 2d and 3d of September, 1792, of which I have ſpoken in the firſt chapter of this work. On this occaſion he was an actor alſo, and is ſaid to have cut above fifty throats with his own hands.

It would have been ſomething unjuſt if a man like this had been forgotten when the Convention was to aſſemble: he was not. The people of Paris, who had been eye-witneſſes of his merit, choſe him for one of their repreſentatives; and he was faithful in the execution of his truſt; for he never talked about any thing but of throats to cut, ſtabbing, and guillotining.

His career, however, was but ſhort. His own neck was not made of iron: a deſperate woman, who had adopted his principles, ruſhed into his apartment, and delivered the world of one of the greateſt monſters that ever diſhonoured it.

There was ſomething horrible in the look of this villain. He was very ſhort and thick, had a black beard aſcending nearly to the extreme corners of his eyes. This beard was uſually long, and his hair ſhort, ſticking up like briſtles. He had ever been dirty, and it may be imagined that the faſhions of

of a revolution, which has made it a crime to be well dreſſed, had not improved his appearance; in ſhort, he was, at the very beſt, a moſt diſguſting mortal, and, therefore, when he came out of the priſon of La Force, all covered with filth and gore, wielding a piſtol in one hand, and a dagger in the other, no wonder that even the ſanguinary mob ran back for fear.

Charlotte Cordée.—As I have entered on a digreſſion, I will continue it a little longer, to give the reader an account of the execution of Charlotte Cordée, the young woman that murdered Marat.

She was not what is commonly called an ariſtocrat; but a patriot of another faction than Marat. She was, as it is ſaid, employed by the party of Briſſot, who, from the accompliſhments of Marat, were afraid that he would totally engroſs the favour and affections of the people. Poor Charlotte received her reward on the ſcaffold; and a very juſt reward too; but there is ſomething ſo ſhocking in the behaviour of her executioner, that it ought not to be omitted in a collection of this kind.

She was a beautiful young woman, extremely fair, and, in any other country, would have brought tears of compaſſion from the ſpectators. The executioner, after having cut off her head, ſeized it by the fine long hair, and, holding it up by one hand, the brutal ruffian gave her a ſlap in the face with the other. The bitch bluſhes, cried he, at any rate. This trait of hangman wit excited the ſavage mirth of the populace *.

We muſt now return to Nantz, where we ſhall find the Revolutionary Committee employed in writing to their friends at Paris.

---

* It is ſomething very remarkable, that her face, ſevered from the body, ſhould bluſh; but it is a real fact, as appears from an eſſay lately republiſhed at Philadelphia, in Gatreau's Gazette.

Before they began to drown and ſhoot by hundreds, they had ſeized on the perſons of one hundred and thirty-two of the moſt opulent men in the city, and ſent them off to Paris to be tried as ſuſpected perſons. It appears, from the whole courſe of the evidence on this head, that the detachment of patriots who conducted them, were, if any pretence could be found, to murder them all by the way. This, however, did not happen. The priſoners arrived ſafe at Paris, and the Committee were obliged to have recourſe to other means to prevent their return. The one that they adopted was, to enſure their guillotining at Paris; and, for this purpoſe, they wrote to the Revolutionary Committee of the ſection of Lepelletier. Their letter is, and I hope it ever will be, a curioſity in this country. I ſhall give it a literal tranſlation, that the reader may be able to do juſtice to the memory of the writers.

Vol. iv. *Page* 179.—*Nantz, this 5th of Pluvioſe. Liberty, Equality, or Death.* Citizens, The people of Nantz, whom we have ſent to Paris, are big villains, all marked with the ſeal of reprobation, and known for counter-revolutioniſts. We are collecting proofs againſt them, which we ſhall ſend, when the bundle is made up, to the revolutionary judges. In the mean time, we *denounce* to you Julienne, who has *officiouſly* taken upon him the defence of theſe *uncivic* vermin.

Vol. iv. *Page* 280.—From the moment the Revolutionary Committee was inſtalled, ſays *Bénet*, the impriſonments began; and they augmented daily. They were all dictated by animoſity, hatred, or avarice. To ſuch a degree did terror prevail, that every man trembled for his life.

For my part, ſays the witneſs, my reſolution was ſhaken. I always went with two loaded piſtols in my pockets: one for the villain that ſhould offer to ſeize

ſeize me, and the other for myſelf. Cruel expectation for a man who had a ſmall helpleſs family! But I had ſeen ſix hundred men at one time plunged into the water, and had been a witneſs of ſhootings amounting to three thouſand ſix hundred perſons at the Gigan: after this, what could any man hope for?

There is reaſon to believe that Carrier meant to murder the whole city; for, before his journey to Paris, he told one of the women whom he kept, and *whoſe huſband he had put to death*, that he would make Nantz remember the name of Carrier: Do not fear, *my dear*, ſaid he; all my friends ſhall follow me; but as for the city, it ſhall be deſtroyed. (*Page* 219.)

I was one day, adds the ſame witneſs, ſent by Bowin to ſee ſome bodies buried, that were left on the public ſquare. There were upwards of thirty women, all naked, and expoſed with the moſt horrible indecency.

Vol. iv. *Page* 206.—*Fontaine.* I went one day to a priſon where a great many women and children were confined. My buſineſs was to deliver proviſions to theſe people; but I found neither fire, lights, nor any thing elſe. I called for a candle, in order to enter this abode of horror. The priſoners were lying here and there on the bare boards, though it was extremely cold.

In a ſecoud viſit that I made here, I found the poor unhappy creatures in a worſe ſituation than before. I ſaw a woman lying dead, and a ſucking child, at a little diſtance from her, wallowing about in the filth; its little face was abſolutely covered with ordure. I gave the keeper ten livres to take care of this helpleſs infant, till I could find a nurſe; but when I came for it, it was gone; and Dumey told me, that the Engliſh priſoners had taken the child, with a promiſe to do well by it.

It ſeems, from the evidence of ſeveral witneſſes, that, while theſe villains were butchering or ſtifling their own countrymen, they took care to treat foreign priſoners with ſome ſort of humanity. This diſtinction fully proves, that they acted by authority of the Convention. But we ſhall ſee this ſo inconteſtably proved by and by, that the remark is hardly neceſſary here.

Vol. iv. *Page* 210.—I ſaw, ſays the ſame witneſs, a man, named Gorgo, come and aſk for a little boy, that he ſaid he had obtained permiſſion to take. The child was found behind a bundle of ſtuff, where he had run to hide upon hearing voices. Gorgo brought him to the doorway, and made him *dance and ſing*.

I have ſelected this laſt fact to ſhow to what a pitch of obduracy, of unfeeling indifference, theſe people were arrived. A thouſand volumes could not paint their familiarity with ſcenes of horror ſo well as this trifling circumſtance of making a child dance and ſing, at the entrance of a cavern of deſpair, a human ſlaughter-houſe, where perhaps his own parents were at that moment groaning their laſt.

Vol. iv. *Page* 210.—*Chaux*, one of the criminals, informs the tribunal, that he was diſpatched from Nantz to wait on Carrier, during his ſtay at Paris. He told me, ſays Chaux, that he did not like Philippes, and that we ſhould guillotine him, at my return.—I have communicated, ſays Carrier, all our proceedings to the National Convention.—You muſt not, adds he, try Lambertye; he is too *precious* a *patriot*. I intend to ſend for him here, and preſent him to the Committee of Public Preſervation *(Salut Public)*, who will not leave him unrecompenſed for his ſervices.

Jicquieau ſays (page 273) that Lambertye was the chief murderer.—This it was that made him a

precious

precious patriot, and a man worthy of a reward from a Committee of the National Convention.

This witneſs adds: When the Committee of Nantz was firſt inſtalled, a deputation was ſent to Carrier, to let him know that no proofs could be made out againſt Jomard. The Repreſentative of the People, ſeeing the deputation enter, cried out, What are all theſe b—gers come here for? When he heard our buſineſs, To hell with you, ſays he, you fool. But ſeeming to grow a little calm, he called me back into his room, and threatened to throw me out of the window. At laſt, ſays the witneſs, he told me there were other means beſides guillotining; You have only, ſays he, to ſend Jomard into the country, and have him diſpatched ſecretly.

Here we behold a Member of the National Convention of France; one of thoſe philoſophical legiſlators, who call themſelves the enlighteners of the univerſe. This baſe, this cowardly cut-throat, this aſſaſſin-general, is one of thoſe men, who we have been told are to regenerate mankind, and to eſtabliſh a ſyſtem of univerſal humanity!

The following traits will depict the leaders in the French revolution.

Vol. iv. *Page* 273.—Robin, ſays a witneſs, was one of the accomplices of Carrier. This Robin, one day, ſhowed his ſabre all ſtained with blood, ſaying, at the ſame time, With this I chopped off ſixty of the heads of the ariſtocrats that we drowned laſt night.

Vol. ii. *Page* 209.—*Fontaine* informs the tribunal, that he was one night at the *Entrepot*. Here, ſays the witneſs, I ſaw a little man (this afterwards appears to have been Fouquet), wearing pantaloons and a liberty cap. It is I, ſaid the little monſter, who conduct all the drownings; it is I who give the word of command to pull up the plugs; nothing is done without my orders. If you will come along

with me, continued he, I will ſhow you how to feed upon the fleſh of an ariſtocrat; I will regale you with the brains of thoſe raſcals.—I trembled, ſays the witneſs, and got away from this cannibal as ſoon as I could.

Vol. iv. *Page* 276.—*Fontbonne* informs the tribunal, that he was one day invited to a dinner, in a pleaſure-garden belonging to Ducrois. Carrier and O'Sullivan were of the party. The converſation turned on the bodily ſtrength of certain perſons, when O'Sullivan obſerved; "Yes, there was my brother, who was deviliſh ſtrong, particularly in the neck, for the executioner was obliged to give him the ſecond ſtroke with the *national razor*, before he could get his head off."

The witneſs adds, O'Sullivan told us, that he was going to drown a man much ſtronger than himſelf; that the man reſiſted, but was knocked down; then, ſays O'Sullivan, I took my knife and ſtuck him, as butchers do the ſheep.

Guedon informs the tribunal (vol. iii. page 277), that he was at the ſame dinner mentioned by Fontbonne. I was ſeated, ſays this witneſs, by the ſide of O'Sullivan; and, during the repaſt, he held up his knife to me, and ſaid, This is excellent to cut a man's throat with; adding, that it had already done him good ſervice in that way. He called on Robin as a witneſs of his bravery, and told us the manner in which he proceeded.—I had remarked, ſays O'Sullivan, that the butchers killed their ſheep by plunging the knife in underneath the ear; ſo, when I had a mind to kill a priſoner, I came up to him, and, clapping him on the ſhoulder in a jocular way, pointed to ſome object that he was obliged to turn his head to ſee; the moment he did this, I had my knife through his neck.

This O'Sullivan, in his defence, ſays, that, as to his brother, he was an enemy of the Republic.

When

When he ſaw, ſays this human butcher, that there was no hope for him, he came and threw himſelf into my arms; but, like a *good republican*, I gave him up to the guillotine.

Vol. ii. *Page* 281.—A witneſs ſays, that Goulin beat his own father with a ſtick, when the old man was on his death-bed; and adds, that his father died in two hours after.

This ſame Goulin (vol. ii. page 253) ſaid in the tribune of his club, Take care not to admit among you moderate men, half patriots. Admit none but real revolutioniſts; none but patriots who have the courage to drink a glaſs of human blood, warm from the veins.

Goulin, ſo far from denying this, ſays before the tribunal (page 254), that he glories in thinking like Marat, who would willingly have quenched his thirſt with the blood of the ariſtocrats.

I ſhall conclude this chapter, this frightful tragedy exhibited at Nantz, with the relation of a few traits of diabolical cruelty, which not only ſurpaſs all that the imagination has hitherto been able to conceive, but even all that has been related in this volume. I have claſſed theſe facts together, that the indignant reader may tear out the leaf, and commit it to the flames.

Yes, ſays the author of *La Conjuration* (page 160), yes; we have ſeen a Repreſentative of the People, a Member of the National Convention, tie four children, the eldeſt of which was but ſixteen years of age, to the four poſts of the guillotine, while the blood of their father and mother ſtreamed on the ſcaffold, and even dropped on their heads.

Vol. ii. *Page* 34.—*Lairet* depoſes, that Deron came to the Popular Society with a man's ear pinned to the national cockade, which he wore in his cap. He went about, ſays the witneſs, with a

pocket full of theſe ears, which he made the female priſoners kiſs.

Vol. ii. *Page* 267.—Many of the generals in La Vendée, ſays Forget, made it their glory to imitate the horrid butchers at Nantz. They committed unheard-of cruelties and indecencies. General Duqueſnoy murdered ſeveral infants at the breaſt, and afterwards attempted to lie with the mothers.

This is the internal monſter that ſtyled himſelf the butcher of the Convention, and that ſaid, nothing hurt him ſo much as not being able to ſerve them in the capacity of executioner.

Vol. ii. *Page* 122.—I ſaw, ſays Girault, about three or four hundred perſons drowned. There were women of all ages amongſt them; ſome were big with child, and of theſe ſeveral were delivered in the very lighters, among water and mud. This moſt ſhocking circumſtance, their groans, their heart-piercing ſhrieks, excited no compaſſion. They, with the fruit of their conjugal love, went to the bottom together.

Vol. ii. *Page* 153.—*Coron.* A woman going to be drowned, was taken in childbirth; ſhe was in the act of delivery, when the horrid villains tore the child from her body, ſtuck it on the point of a bayonet, and thus carried it to the river.

A fourth of theſe, our repreſentatives (ſays the author of La Conjuration, page 162), a fourth (great God! my heart dies within me), a fourth ripped open the wombs of the mothers, tore out the palpitating embryo, to deck the point of a pike of liberty and equality.

The reader's curioſity may, perhaps, lead him to wiſh to know the whole number of perſons put to death at Nantz; but, in this, it would be difficult to gratify him. I have been able to obtain but *five* volumes of the trial, which make only a part of that work; probably the laſt volume may contain an

an exact account as to numbers. The deaths muſt, however, have been immenſe, ſince a witneſs depoſes (vol. iii. page 55) to the drowning of *nine thouſand* perſons; and another witneſs (vol. ii. page 253) atteſts, that *ſeven thouſand five hundred* were ſhot *en maſſe*.

The number of bodies thrown into the river Loire, which is half the width of the Delaware at Philadelphia, was ſo conſiderable, that the municipal officers found it neceſſary to iſſue a proclamation (vol. v. page 70), *forbidding the uſe of its waters*.

It has been generally computed that the number of perſons, belonging to this unfortunate city and its environs, who were drowned, ſhot *en maſſe*, guillotined, and ſtifled or ſtarved in priſon, amounted to about *forty* thouſand. And this computation is corroborated by the author of La Conjuration, who ſays (page 159), The number of perſons murdered in the South of France, during the ſpace of a very few months, is reckoned at a hundred thouſand. The bodies thrown into the Loire are innumerable. Carrier alone put to death *more than forty thouſand*, including men, women, and children.

It appears then that theſe bloody revolutioniſts, who ſtyled themſelves the Friends of Freedom and of Mankind, deſtroyed, in one city of France, a population equal to that of the capital of the United States.

CHAP. IV.

Facts from ſeveral Works, proving that the Cruelties related in the preceding Chapters were authorized, or approved of, by the National Aſſemblies.

AFTER having led the reader through ſuch rivers of blood, it ſeems indiſpenſably neceſſary to inſert

inſert a few facts, ſhowing by whoſe authority that blood was ſpilt; for it could anſwer no good purpoſe to excite this deteſtation, without directing it towards the proper object.

When the French firſt began that career of inſurrection, robbery, and murder, which aſſumed the name of a Revolution, the people of this country, or at leaſt the moſt numerous part of them, felt uncommon anxiety for its ſucceſs. The people were deceived; but the deception was an agreeable one; the word *Revolution* had of itſelf very great charms, but when that of *Liberty* was added to it, it could not fail of exciting enthuſiaſm. This enthuſiaſm was, indeed, nearly general; and this alone was a ſufficient inducement for the public prints to become the partiſans of Condorcet and Mirabeau. All the avenues to truth were at once barred up; and, though the revolutioniſts every day changed their creed, though one revolving moon ſaw them make and break their oaths, all was amply atoned for by their being engaged in a revolution.

As the revolution advanced, the enthuſiaſm increaſed; but from the moment that the French nation declared itſelf a *republic*, this enthuſiaſm was changed to madneſs. All the means by which this change of government was to be accompliſhed were totally overlooked; nothing was talked or dreamed of but the enfranchiſement of the world; the whole univerſe was to become a republic, or be annihilated; and happy was he who could bawl loudeſt about a certain ſomething, called *liberty and equality*.

During this political madneſs, however, now and then a trait of ſhocking barbarity, in ſpite of all the endeavours of the public papers, burſt in upon us, and produced a lucid interval; but theſe intervals have never yet been of long duration; becauſe every ſubterfuge, that intereſted falſehood can deviſe, has been made uſe of to give our abhorrence a direction

direction contrary to that which it ought to have taken. We have heard Briſſot, Danton, Marat, and Robeſpierre, all accuſed in their turns of ſhedding innocent blood; but the *National Aſſembly* itſelf, they tell us, has ever remained worthy of our admiration. The poor unſucceſsful agents of this terrible divan have been devoted to execration, as tyrants, while their employers have been, and are yet held up to us as the friends of liberty and the lovers of mankind.

Without further remark, I ſhall add ſuch facts, as, I imagine, will enable every reader to judge for himſelf.

To begin with the Conſtituent Aſſembly; one proof of their approving of murder, will ſuffice. They honoured with the title of *vanquiſhers*, a blood-thirſty mob, who, after having taken two men priſoners, cruelly maſſacred them, and carried their heads about the ſtreets of Paris on a pike. *See Rabaud's Hiſtory of the French Revolution*, page 106.

The ſecond Aſſembly, when they received advices of the murders of Jourdan and his aſſociates at Avignon, as mentioned in the firſt chapter of this work, threatened the Member who communicated the news, becauſe he had called the murderers *brigands*, and not *patriots*. *See La Gazette Univerſelle* for the month of May, 1792.—And how did this Aſſembly behave, when informed of the maſſacres in the priſons of Paris, during the firſt days of September, 1792? Tallien (of whom we have lately heard ſo much) came to the National Aſſembly, and informed them of the murdering in the following remarkable words: "The Commiſ-" ſaries have done all they could to prevent the *diſ-*" *orders* (the maſſacreing the priſoners is what he " calls *diſorders)*, but they have not been able to " ſtop the, in ſome ſort, *juſt vengeance* of the peo-" ple."—The Aſſembly heard this language very quietly; and Doctor Moore, from whoſe Journal

(page

(page 178) the fact is taken, makes an apology for the Aſſembly, by ſaying that they were *overawed:* but it has ſince fully appeared, that the leading members were the very perſons who contrived the maſſacre, with the aid of Petion, Manuel, and Marat.—It is a well-known fact, recorded by the Abbé Barruel (page 334), that *Louvet*, one of the members of the preſent Aſſembly, gave, the day after the September maſſacre, an order on the public treaſury, in the following words: "*On ſight*, "*pay to the four bearers each twelve livres, for aiding* "*in the diſpatching of the prieſts at the priſon of St.* "*Firmin.*"—Louvet was, at the time of writing this note on demand for murderers' wages, a *legiſlator*; and I cannot help remarking here, that a printer of a newſpaper in the United States has lately boaſted, that this Louvet, "now Preſident of the firſt Aſſembly on earth," ſays our printer, was the *editor of a Gazette!*—People ſhould be cautious how they boaſt of relationſhip with the legiſlators in that country of equality.

As it will no longer be pretended, I ſuppoſe, that this ſecond Aſſembly diſapproved of the murders that were committed under their reign, I will now turn to the third Aſſembly, which we commonly call a Convention. And, not to tire the reader with proofs of what is ſelf-evident, I ſhall confine myſelf to an extract or two from the trial of Carrier and the Revolutionary Committee of Nantz.

Vol. v. *Page* 49.—It is time, ſays Goulin, to tear aſide the veil. The Repreſentatives Bourbotte and Bô knew all about the drownings and ſhootings; and Bô even ſaid to Huchet, in ſpeaking of the members of the Revolutionary Committee, that it was *not for the murders* that they were to be tried.

After this the Counſellor for the Committee aſks this Citizen Bô, what was the real motive for bringing the Committee to trial: and the other confeſſes, that it was for their having *miſapplied the treaſures* taken

taken from the priſoners. He pretends (page 60), though he had taken the place of Carrier at Nantz, and though the water of the river could not be drank, on account of the dead bodies that were floating on it; though a hundred or two of ditches had been dug to put the people into that were ſhot; and though the city was filled with cries and lamentations; notwithſtanding all this, he pretends that he could ſay nothing for certain *about the murders*.

This repreſentative Bô (page 83) is convicted of having himſelf juſtified the conduct of the Committee and of Carrier.

Carrier, in his defence, ſays, that he had done no more than *his duty*, and that *the Convention had been regularly informed of every thing*. They complain now, ſays he (page 119), of ſhootings *en maſſe*, as if *the ſame had not been done at Angers, Saumur, Laval, and every where elſe*.

A witneſs (vol. v. page 60) informs the tribunal, that he, who was himſelf a Member of the Convention, *had informed that body of horrors that were committed at Nantz*, and particularly of the *maſſacres of women and children*.

The author of *La Conjuration*, ſo often quoted, ſays (page 162), When the bloody Carrier wrote to the Convention that he was diſpatching hundreds at a time by means of lighters with plugs in the bottom, Carrier was not blamed; on the contrary, he was *repeatedly applauded*, as being the author of *an invention that did honour to his country!*

But what need have we of theſe proofs? What other teſtimony do we want, than that contained in their own murderous decrees? Let any one caſt his eye on the oppoſite page; let him there behold the ſcene that was daily exhibited before the windows of their hall, and then let him ſay whether they delighted in murder or not. Blood is their element, as water is that of the finny race.

One thing, however, remains to be accounted

for; and that is, how ſo great a part of the nation were led to butcher each other; how they were brought to that pitch of brutal ſanguinary ferocity, which we have ſeen ſo amply diſplayed in the preceding chapters. This is what, with the reader's indulgence, I ſhall now, agreeably to my promiſe endeavour to explain.

AN

INSTRUCTIVE ESSAY,

Tracing all the Horrors of the French Revolution to their real Cauſes, the licentious Politics and infidel Philoſophy of the preſent Age.

IT has been aſſerted, again and again, by the partiſans of the French revolution, that all the crimes which have diſgraced it, are to be aſcribed to the hoſtile operations of their enemies. They have told us, that, had not the Auſtrians and Pruſſians been on their march to Paris, the priſoners would not have been maſſacred on the 2d and 3d of September, 1792. But can we poſſibly conceive how the murder of eight thouſand poor priſoners, locked up and bound, could be neceſſary to the defence of a capital containing a million of inhabitants? Can we believe that the ſabres of the aſſaſſins would not have been more effectually employed againſt the invaders, than againſt defenceleſs prieſts and women?

The deluded populace were told not "to leave "the wolves in the fold while they went to attack "thoſe that were without." But theſe wolves, if they were ſuch, were in priſon; were under a guard an hundred thouſand times as ſtrong as themſelves, and could have been deſtroyed at a moment's warning. There is ſomething ſo abominably cowardly in

this juſtification, that it is even more baſe than the crime. Suppoſe that a hundred thouſand men had marched from Paris, to make head againſt the Auſtrians and Pruſſians, there were yet nine hundred thouſand left to guard the unhappy wretches that were tied hand and foot. Where could be the neceſſity of maſſacreing them? Where could be the neceſſity of hacking them to pieces, tearing out their bowels, and biting their hearts?

Subſequent events have fully proved, that it was not danger that produced theſe bloody meaſures; for we have ever ſeen the revolutioniſts moſt cruel in times of their greateſt ſecurity. Their butcheries at Lyons and in its neighbourhood did not begin till they were completely triumphant. It was then, at the moment when they had no retaliation to fear, that they commenced their bloody work. Carrier, lolling at his eaſe, ſent the victims to death by hundreds. The blood never flowed from the guillotine in ſuch torrents, as at the very time when their armies were driving their enemies before them in every direction.

It has been ſaid in the Britiſh Houſe of Commons, that the maſſacres in France ought to be attributed to the Allied Powers. "You hunt them "like wild beaſts, and then you complain of them "for being ferocious." How this hunting could drive the French to butcher one another, I cannot ſee; but if it was a juſtifiable reaſon for them, it might certainly be applied with much more juſtice to their enemies; for theſe have been oftener obliged to fly than the French. The revolutionary armies have overrun an extent of territory equal to one third of their own country: the Savoyards, the Germans, the Flemings, the Dutch, the Spaniards, and the Engliſh, have been obliged to fly before them; but we have heard of no maſſacres among theſe people. The French moſt unmercifully put

to

to death eight thouſand of their country people, who were in the priſons of Paris, and, as an excuſe for this, they tell us that the Duke of Brunſwick had invaded the province of Champagne; but they themſelves have overrun all the United Netherlands, and even taken poſſeſſion of the capital; and we have not heard that the Dutch have, as yet, been guilty of a ſingle maſſacre. They have found but one place in all their career, where the people could be prevailed on to erect a guillotine, and that was at Geneva. Here their army was more numerous than the whole population of the State, and therefore their ſyſtem was fully adopted; yet, even here, among this little debaſed and tyrannized people, there were to be found no villains infamous enough to imitate their maſters in murdering women and children. That was a ſpecies of ſlaughter reſerved for the French nation alone.

The French revolution has been compared to that of America, and I have heard ſome men calling themſelves Americans, who have not been aſhamed to ſay, that as great cruelties were committed in this country as in that. I would now aſk theſe men, who are ſo anxious to be thought as bloody as the ſans-culotte French, if they can give me one inſtance of the Americans murdering their townſmen at the approach of the enemy? When the Britiſh army ſucceeded that of the Congreſs at Philadelphia, did the continental troops murder all the Tories before they quitted the city? Can theſe generous friends of the French revolution tell us of any maſſacres that took place in this country? Did they ever hear of women and children being drowned and ſhot by hundreds? Seven years of civil war deſolated theſe States, but the blood of one ſingle woman or child never ſtained the earth.

If the doctrine be admitted, if a people be juſtifiable in entering on a ſeries of maſſacres the inſtant they

they are preſſed by an enemy from without, what ſafety can there be for any of us? If a declaration of war is to unſheath the daggers of all the aſſaſſins in the community, civil ſociety is the greateſt curſe that ever fell upon mankind. Much better and ſafer were it for us to ſeparate and prowl about like ſavages, nay like beaſts, than to live thus, in continual trepidation, in continual fear for our throats.

There is ſomething ſo exceedingly cowardly and ridiculous in this juſtification, that even the French revolutioniſts are aſhamed of it. They have recourſe to another ſtill more diſhonourable, it is true, but leſs cowardly. They tell us, that all the aſſaſſins in France have been in the pay of Great Britain; or, to make uſe of their own expreſſion, have been excited to action by the "*gold of Pitt.*"

As I wiſh to advance nothing without the beſt poſſible authority, I ſhall here inſert a paſſage on this ſubject, taken from a Gazette publiſhed at Philadelphia by one *Gatreau*, and at the preſs of *Moreau de St. Mery*, who was a member of the Conſtituent Aſſembly of France.

The intention of the piece evidently is to juſtify the French character, or rather the character of the French revolutioniſts, by attributing the horrid deeds theſe latter have committed, to ſome cauſe other than their own diſpoſitions and anarchical principles. To avoid all cavil with reſpect to the authenticity of the extract, and the correctneſs of the tranſlation, I will firſt give it in French, and then in Engliſh, obſerving, for the farther ſatisfaction of the reader, that he may find the piece entire in the Gazette above mentioned, of the 4th of February, 1796.

" Quel homme éclairé par l'éxpérience, nieroit
" aujourd'hui, que, de la tête de Pitt ſont ſortis
" tous les crimes qui feſoient abhorrer la revolu-
" tion par ceux-la meme qui en adoroient les prin-
" cipes:

" cipes ; que, c'eſt au foyer de la jalouſie et de la " haine Angloiſe, que s'allumèrent les torches, que " ſe forgèrent les poignards, qui ont fait un mon- " ceau de cendres et de ſang des plus belles poſſeſ- " ſion du monde ?—Quel génie malfaiſant créa les " factions impies, ſanguinaires ou ambitieuſes, qui " devoient anéantir la France, au du moins la re- " placer ſous le joug, ſi la Providence ne déconcer- " toit pas toujours les complots de l'iniquité ?—Le " génie infernal du miniſtre Anglois.—C'eſt avec " l'or de ſes victimes de l'Inde qu'il payoit le ſang " François, verſé à grands flots à Paris, dans les " departemens, aux frontières et dans les colo- " nies.——

" What man, enlightened by experience, will " now deny, that from the head of Pitt have come " all the crimes which have rendered the revolu- " tion deteſtable in the eyes of even thoſe who " adored its principles; that it was Engliſh jea- " louſy and hatred that lighted the flames, and " ſharpened the poniards, which have reduced the " fineſt poſſeſſions in the world to a heap of aſhes " and blood ?—What evil genius created the im- " pious, ſanguinary, and ambitious factions, that " were to annihilate France; or at leaſt bend it " again beneath the yoke, if Providence had not " diſconcerted the plans of iniquity ?—The infernal " genius of the Engliſh Miniſter. It was with the " gold drawn from the victims in India, that he " paid for the French blood, which has flowed in " rivers at Paris, in the departments, on the fron- " tiers, and in the colonies."

This is an *important*, and were it not ſo very hackneyed and threadbare, I would call it a "*pre- " cious confeſſion.*" Here we ſee a Frenchman, a partiſan of, and perhaps an actor in, the revolu- tion, endeavouring to wipe away the ſtain on its principles, by aſcribing all the horrors thoſe princi-

ples have produced, to the gold diſtributed among the revolutioniſts by the Engliſh Miniſter. The cruelties that have been committed were not, then, neceſſary to the eſtabliſhment of a free government; they were not the effect of irritation, of anarchical confuſion, of vindictive retaliation; they were not the natural conſequence of a long-oppreſſed people's breaking their chains and riſing on their tyrants: all theſe excuſes (which I muſt allow were ſilly enough) are at once done away by this new juſtification; for we are here told, in ſo many words, that the French people have ſhed rivers of each other's blood, in every part of their dominions, purely for the love—not of *liberty*, but of *the gold of Pitt*.

There is ſuch a natural connexion between the meaſures of the ſeveral National Aſſemblies and the maſſacres that were the immediate conſequence of them, that it is impoſſible to effect a ſeparation without the utmoſt violence to all manner of reaſoning and truth. If it was the *gold of Pitt* that paid for all the French blood that has been ſpilled, it muſt have been that gold that paid for the inhuman murder of Meſſrs. Launay and Fleſſel; and it muſt have been that gold which induced the Conſtituent Aſſembly to ſanction the murder, by giving the aſſaſſins of theſe gentlemen the title of *heroes* and *conquerors*, and by inſtituting a national feſtival in their honour.

The revolution was begun, and has hitherto been maintained, by the ſhedding of innocent blood; therefore, if it was the *gold of Pitt* that paid for that blood, it is to the *gold of Pitt* that the revolution is to be aſcribed, and not to that patriotic ſpirit and love of liberty, with which we have been ſo long amuſed. In the fifth chapter of this work, it is inconteſtably proved, that the ſeveral National Aſſemblies authorized or approved of all the maſſacres

which have diſgraced their country: if, then, theſe maſſacres were paid for by Mr. Pitt, muſt we not inevitably conclude that the National Aſſemblies were in the ſame pay? If Mr. Pitt paid for the blood of the family of Bourbon, for that of the King's guards, of the nobility, the clergy, the bankers, the merchants, in ſhort, of all the rich or ariſtocrats, as they are called, it was Mr. Pitt who deſtroyed the monarchy: it was he who cauſed France to be a republic, and who gave riſe to the doctrine of equality. Thoſe, therefore, who talk of the *gold of Pitt*, muſt ceaſe all their fulſome eulogiums on theſe gallant republicans; for, if they are to have a republic, it will, according to their own confeſſions, be the work of the Engliſh Miniſter.

This vindication, throwing the blame on the *gold of Pitt*, amply participates in the misfortune of all the vindications that have lately appeared amongſt us; that is, it takes up a bad cauſe, and makes it worſe. The reader will certainly feel with me, an inexpreſſible indignation at a people, who, becauſe an hoſtile army was on their frontiers, could be prevailed on to butcher thouſands upon thouſands of their innocent countrymen; who could cut the throats of their fathers and mothers, rip up the bowels of women with child, and carry about the trophies of their baſe and ſavage triumph on the points of their pikes and bayonets; but what will be his feelings, what will contain his ſwelling heart, when he is told, that all this was undertaken and perpetuated for foreign gold? The revolutioniſts, by accuſing Mr. Pitt of being at the bottom of their maſſacres, do not perceive, without doubt, that they are heaping ten times tenfold infamy on themſelves and their nation.

By alleging this influence of Britiſh gold, the writer I have above quoted reduces himſelf and the partiſans of the revolution to a moſt diſtreſſing dilemma.

lemma. He owns that rivers of French blood have flowed at Paris, in the departments, on the frontiers, and in the colonies; and he tells us, that this blood was paid for with the gold of Pitt. Now, admitting this to be true, this blood has been ſhed, and this gold received, by *Frenchmen.* To what, then, will our author aſcribe this ſanguinary avarice? He muſt either aſcribe it to the *natural diſpoſition* of his countrymen, or *a change* in that natural diſpoſition, *produced by the revolution.* It is uncertain which of theſe he may chooſe, but it is very certain, chooſe which he will, that he has held up the character of his nation, or the principles of the revolution, to deteſtation and abhorrence.

This is the way he has juſtified the French in the eyes of the people of this country. Infinitely better were it for ſuch juſtifiers to ſuffer the preſs to reſt in eternal inaction. All that a good Frenchman can do, is to weep over the diſgrace of his country; for, ſo long as murder, horrid, barbarous, ſavage murder, ſhall admit of no excuſe, ſo long ſhall the actions of the French revolutioniſts remain unjuſtifiable.

It is more than probable, that a writer of this ſtamp might be willing to allow that his countrymen were always naturally ferocious and bloody-minded, rather than confeſs that this diſpoſition has been produced by the principles of the revolution: for patriots of this kind are ever ready to ſacrifice the honour of their country to the ſupport of their ſyſtems. But juſtice demands from us to reject with diſdain every ſuch concluſion. We have ſeen the French people ſprightly, beneficent, humane, and happy; let us now follow them, ſtep by ſtep, into the awful oppoſite, and ſee for ourſelves, by what diabolical means the change has been effected.

The firſt National Aſſembly had hardly aſſumed that title, when they diſcovered an intention of overturning the Government, which had been called to e'er, and which their conſtituents had enjoined them to ſupport, and of levelling all ranks and diſtinctions among the different orders in the community. To this they were not led, as it had been ſo falſely pretended, by their love of liberty and deſire of ſeeing their country happy; but by envy, curſed envy, that will never let the fiery demagogue ſleep in peace, while he ſees a greater or richer than himſelf. It has been objected to this, that there were, among the revolutioniſts, men who already enjoyed diſtinguiſhed honours; but it is forgotten at the ſame time, that ambition will be at the top, or no where; that it will deſtroy itſelf with the envied object, rather than act a ſubaltern part. The motto of a demagogue is that of Milton's Satan: "Better to reign in hell than ſerve in heaven."

This taſk of deſtruction was, however, an arduous one. To tear the complicated work of fourteen centuries to pieces at once, to render honours diſhonourable, and turn reverential awe into contempt and mockery, was not to be accompliſhed but by extraordinary means. It was evident that property muſt change hands, that the beſt blood of the nation muſt flow in torrents, or the project muſt fail. The Aſſembly, to arm the multitude on their ſide, broached the popular doctrine of *equality*. It was a neceſſary part of the plan of theſe reformers to ſeduce the people to their ſupport; and ſuch was the credulity of the unfortunate French, that they ſoon began to look on them as the oracles of virtue and wiſdom, and believed themſelves raiſed, by one ſhort ſentence iſſued by theſe ambitious impoſtors, from the ſtate of *ſubjects* to that of *ſovereigns*.

"I puniſhed," ſays Solon, the Athenian lawgiver, "I puniſhed with death all thoſe aſpiring "diſturbers

" diſturbers of the commonwealth, who, in order to " domineer themſelves, and lead the vulgar in their " train, pretended that all men were equal, and " ſought to confound the different ranks in ſociety, " by preaching up a chimerical equality, that never " did or can exiſt." How happy would it have been for France, had there been ſome Solon endued with wiſdom and power enough to puniſh the political mountebanks of the Conſtituent Aſſembly! What dreadful carnage, what indelible diſgrace, the nation would have eſcaped! Hardly had the word *equality* been pronounced, when the whole kingdom became a ſcene of anarchy and confuſion. The name of liberty (I ſay the *name*, for the regenerated French have known nothing but the name), the name of liberty had already half turned the heads of the people, and that of equality finiſhed the work. From the moment it ſounded in their ears, all that had formerly inſpired reſpect, all that they had reverenced and adored, even began to excite contempt and fury. Birth, beauty, old age, all became the victims of a deſtructive equality, erected into a law by an Aſſembly of ambitious tyrants, who were ready to deſtroy every thing that croſſed their way to abſolute domination.

One of the immediate effects of the promulgation of this doctrine, was the murder of Monſieur Foulon and his ſon-in-law Berthier; who, without ſo much as being charged with any crime, were taken by the people, conducted to Paris, and cruelly maſſacred. I will ſay nothing (ſays *Du Gour*, in his eloquent *Memoire*, page 35), I will ſay nothing of the ſavage cruelties committed on Foulon and Berthier; I will not repreſent the bloody head of the father-in-law, offered to the ſon to kiſs, preſſed againſt his lips, and afterwards put under his feet; I will not repreſent the inhuman aſſaſſins ruſhing on Berthier, tearing out his heart, and placing it, qui-

vering and ſtill palpitating, on the table of the town-hall, *before the magiſtrates* of the commune. After this, their heads were ſtuck on pikes, and the heart of Berthier on the point of a ſword. In this manner they were carried through the ſtreets, followed by the exulting populace (ſee *Rabaut*'s Hiſtory of the French Revolution, page 117). Nor let it be pretended that the Aſſembly could not prevent this ſhameful, this bloody deed. They had the abſolute command of Paris at the time, and had two hundred thouſand armed men ready to obey their nod. But the Aſſembly never oppoſed the murder of thoſe whom they looked upon as their enemies; nay, Rabaut, their partial hiſtorian (who was one of their body), even juſtifies the murder.

When the word *equality* found its way to the colonies, it was only a ſignal for aſſaſſination. At Port-au-Prince, the Chevalier de Mauduit, a brave and generous officer, who rendered eſſential ſervices to this country during the laſt war, was murdered by his own ſoldiers. The villains had the inſolence to order him to kneel down before them: "No," ſaid he, like a ſoldier as he was, "it ſhall "never be ſaid that Thomas Mauduit bent his "knee before a ſet of ſcoundrels!" His head was cut off; he was torn limb from limb; his bowels were trailed along the ſtreet, as butchers do thoſe of beaſts in a ſlaughter-houſe. The next morning the different members of his body, and morſels of his fleſh, were ſtrewn about oppoſite his houſe, and his bloody and ghaſtly head placed on the ſtep of the doorway. We know we have before our eyes the proofs of what havoc, diſtreſs, and deſtruction this deteſtable word has ſince produced in the unfortunate iſland of St. Domingo.

It was now that the ſovereign people, entering on their reign, firſt took the famous plundering motto: "*La guerre aux chateaux, et la paix aux chaumières*;

chaumières;" that is, *War to the gentlemen's houſes, and peace to the cottage*; or, in other words, *War to all thoſe who have any thing to loſe.* This motto is extremely comprehenſive; it includes the whole doctrine of equality. It was not a vain declaration in France; but was put in practice with that patriotic zeal which has marked the whole courſe of the revolution. To be rich, or of a good family, became a crime, which was often expiated by the loſs of life. Men took as much pains to be thought obſcure vagabonds, as they had formerly done to be thought wealthy and of honeſt deſcent; and what diſtinguiſhes the French revolution from all others in the world, to have a ragged pair of breeches, or to be totally in want of that ſo neceſſary an article of dreſs, was eſteemed the ſureſt mark of pure patriotiſm, and was the greateſt recommendation to public favour.

But the National Aſſembly, though heartily ſeconded by myriads of ragged populace, knew, however, that they could not long depend upon ſuch a promiſcuous ſupport. The citizens were, therefore, to be ſoldiers at the ſame time, and placed under the command of the creatures of the Aſſembly. To this end the territory of the nation underwent a new diviſion, on the levelling plan. The provinces of France were melted down into a rude undigeſted maſs of departments, diſtricts, and municipalities. All the old magiſtrates were replaced by the vileſt wretches that could be found. There were forty-four thouſand municipalities: each of theſe had ſeveral municipal officers; and each of theſe latter his troop of revolutionary myrmidons. There could not be leſs than three millions of men in arms, ready to burn, cut, and ſlay, at a moment's warning. Nothing was to be ſeen or heard but the patrolling of theſe ſons of equality. The Aſſembly pretended to hold out the olive-branch, while they

were

were forming the nation into a camp. The peaceable man trembled for his life. One muſt have been an eye-witneſs of the change produced by theſe meaſures, to have the leaſt idea of it. All was ſuſpicion and dread. The bell that had never rung but to call the peaceful villagers to the altar, was converted into a ſignal of approaching danger; and the tree, beneath which they formerly danced, became an alarm-poſt. The ragged, greaſy magiſtrates, with their municipal troops at their heels, were for ever prowling about for their prey, the property of others. Theſe little platoons of cut-throats ranged the country round, crying havoc, burning and laying waſte wherever they came. They had not yet begun to murder frequently; but it was of little conſequence to a man whether his brains were blowed out or not, after having ſeen himſelf and family reduced, in the ſpace of a few hours, from affluence to beggary. A band of theſe enlightened ruffians went to the *chateau*, or country-houſe of a gentleman in Provence, and demanded that his perſon ſhould be delivered into their hands. The ſervants defended the houſe for ſome time, but in vain; they advanced to the front door, when the lady of the houſe appeared with her child in her arms, and endeavoured to pacify them, ſaying, that her huſband was gone out at the back door. The ruffians inſtantly ſet fire to the houſe. When the lady perceived this, ſhe confeſſed that her huſband was hidden in one of the garrets. The houſe was now on fire; ſhe left her child, and ruſhed through the flames to call her huſband from his retreat, but ſhe was ſtifled in the paſſage, and burnt to death, and her huſband ſhared in her fate, leaving a helpleſs infant to the mercy of the murderers of its father and mother.—A hundred volumes like this could not contain the horrors that

theſe

theſe revolutionary robbers committed in the name of liberty and equality.

Let this, Americans, be a leſſon to you; throw from you the doctrine of equality as you would the poiſoned chalice. Wherever this deteſtable principle gains ground to any extent, ruin muſt inevitably enſue. Would you ſtifle the noble flame of emulation, and encourage ignorance and idleneſs? Would you inculcate defiance of the laws? Would you teach ſervants to be diſobedient to their maſters, and children to their parents? Would you ſow the ſeeds of envy, hatred, robbery, and murder? Would you break all the bands of ſociety aſunder, and turn a civilized people into a horde of ſavages? This is all done by the comprehenſive word *equality*. But they tell us we are not to take it in the unqualified ſenſe. In what ſenſe are we to take it then? Either it means ſomething more than liberty, or it means nothing at all. The miſconſtruction of the word *liberty* has done miſchief enough in the world; to add to it a word of ſtill more dangerous extent, was to kindle a flame that never can be extinguiſhed but by the total debaſement, if not deſtruction, of the ſociety who are ſilly or wicked enough to adopt its uſe. We are told, that every government receives with its exiſtence the latent diſeaſe that is one day to accompliſh its death; but the government that is attacked with this political apoplexy is annihilated in the twinkling of an eye.

The civil diſorganization of the ſtate was but the forerunner of thoſe curſes which the Aſſembly had in ſtore for their devoted country. They plainly perceived that they never ſhould be able to brutify the people to their wiſhes without removing the formidable barriers of religion and morality. Their heads were turned, but it was neceſſary to corrupt their hearts.

Beſides this, the leaders in the Aſſembly were profeſſed

profeſſed modern philoſophers; that is to ſay, atheiſts or deiſts. Camus and Condorcet openly taught atheiſm, and Ceruti ſaid, with his laſt breath, "*The only regret I have in quitting this world, is, that "I leave a religion on earth.*" Theſe words, the blaſphemy of an expiring demon, were applauded by the aſſembled Legiſlators. It was not to be wondered at, that the vanity of ſuch men ſhould be flattered in the hope of changing the moſt Chriſtian country into the moſt infidel upon the face of the earth; for there is a ſort of fanaticiſm in irreligion, that leads the profligate atheiſt to ſeek for proſelytes with a zeal that would do honour to a good cauſe, but which, employed in a bad one, becomes the ſcourge of ſociety.

The zeal of theſe philoſophers for extirpating the truth was as great at leaſt as that ſhown by the primitive Chriſtians for its propagation. But they proceeded in a very different manner. At firſt, ſome circumſpection was neceſſary. The more effectually to deſtroy the Chriſtian religion altogether, they began by ſapping the foundation of the Catholic faith, the only one that the people had been taught to revere. They formed a ſchiſm with the Church of Rome, well knowing that the opinions of the vulgar, once ſet afloat, were as likely to fix on atheiſm as on any other ſyſtem: and more ſo, as being leſs oppoſed to their levelling principles than the rigid though ſimple morality of the Goſpel. A religion that teaches obedience to the higher powers, inculcates humility and peace, ſtrictly forbids robbery and murder, and, in ſhort, enjoins on men to do as they would be done unto, could by no means ſuit the armed ruffians who were to accompliſh the views of the French Aſſembly.

The preſs, which was made free for the worſt of purpoſes, lent moſt powerful aid to theſe deſtructive reformers. While the Catholic religion was ridiculed

culed and abuſed, no other Chriſtian ſyſtem was propoſed in its ſtead; on the contrary, the profligate wretches who conducted the public prints, among whom were Mirabeau, Marat, Condorcet, and Hebert, filled one half of their impious ſheets with whatever could be thought of to degrade all religion in general. The miniſters of divine worſhip, of every ſect and denomination, were repreſented as cheats, and as the avowed enemies of the ſublime and ſentimental ſomething which the Aſſembly had in ſtore for the regeneration of the world.

Moſt of my readers muſt have heard of the magnificent church of St. Geneviève at Paris: it was one of the moſt noble ſtructures that the world had ever ſeen, and had, beſides, the honour of being conſecrated to the worſhip of Chriſt. This edifice the blaſphemers ſeized on as a receptacle for the remains of their "*great men.*" From a Chriſtian church they changed it into a Pagan temple, and gave it the name of *Pantheon.* Condorcet, pre-eminent in infamy, propoſed the decree by which the name of God and that of St. Geneviève were ordered to be effaced from the frontiſpiece.

To this *Pantheon* the aſhes of Voltaire were firſt tranſported, and the Aſſembly ſpent no leſs than three days in determining whether thoſe of *Rouſſeau* ſhould not accompany them. The diſtinction paid to two of the moſt celebrated deiſts of the age, was a full declaration of the principles, as well as the intention, of the majority of the Aſſembly.

Thoſe who have not had the patience to wade through the lies and blaſphemies of Voltaire, know his principles from report. *Rouſſeau* is not ſo well known; and as he was, and ſtill continues to be, the great oracle of the revolutioniſts, I am perſuaded a page or two on his character, and that of his works, will not be loſt here, particularly as I have.

heard both mentioned with applauſe, in this country, by perſons apparently of the beſt intentions.

The philoſopher Rouſſeau, the pagod of the regenerated French, was born at Geneva; and, at a proper age, he was bound an apprentice to an artiſt. During his apprenticeſhip he frequently robbed his maſter, as well as other perſons. Before his time was expired he decamped, fled into the dominions of the King of Sardinia, where he changed the Preſbyterian for the Catholic religion. This beginning ſeemed to promiſe fair for what followed. By an unexpected turn of fortune he became a footman, in which capacity he did not forget his old habit of ſtealing. He is detected with the ſtolen goods; ſwears they were given to him by a maid-ſervant of the houſe; the girl is confronted with him; ſhe denies the fact, and weeping preſſes him to confeſs the truth; but the young philoſopher ſtill perſiſts in the lie, and the poor girl is driven from her place in diſgrace. Tired of being a ſervingman, he went to throw himſelf on the protection of a lady, whom he had ſeen once before, and who he proteſts was the moſt virtuous creature of her ſex. This lady had ſo great a regard for him, that ſhe called him her little darling, and he called her mamma. Mamma had a footman, who ſerved her, beſides, in another capacity very much reſembling that of a huſband; but ſhe had a moſt tender affection for her adopted ſon Rouſſeau, and, as ſhe feared he was forming connexions with a certain lady that might ſpoil his morals, ſhe herſelf, out of pure virtue, took him—to bed with her! This virtuous effort to preſerve the purity of Rouſſeau's heart, had a dreadful effect on the head of the poor footman, and ſo he poiſoned himſelf—Rouſſeau fell ſick, and mamma was obliged to part with little darling, while he performed a journey to the

ſouth

ſouth of France for the recovery of his health. On the road he dines with a gentleman, and lies with his wife. As he was returning back he debated with himſelf whether he ſhould pay this lady a ſecond viſit or not; but, fearing he might be tempted to ſeduce her daughter alſo, virtue got the better, and determined the little darling to fly home into the arms of his mamma; but, alas! thoſe arms were filled with another. Mamma's virtue had prompted her to take a ſubſtitute, whom ſhe liked too well to part with, and our philoſopher was obliged to ſhift for himſelf. I ſhould have told the reader, that the little darling, while he reſided with his mamma, went to make a tour with a young muſician. Their friendſhip was warm, like that of moſt young men, and they were, beſides, enjoined to take particular care of each other during their travels. They travelled on for ſome time, agreed perfectly well, and vowed an everlaſting friendſhip for each other: but the muſician being one day taken in a fit, fell down in the ſtreet, which furniſhed the faithful Rouſſeau with an opportunity of ſlipping off with ſome of his things, and leaving him to the mercy of the people in a town where he was a total ſtranger.

We ſeldom meet with ſo much villany in a youth. His manhood was worthy of it. He turned apoſtate a ſecond time, was driven from within the walls of his native city of Geneva as an incendiary, and an apoſtle of anarchy and infidelity; nor did he forget how to thieve. At laſt the philoſopher marries, but like a philoſopher, that is, without going to church. He has a family of children, and, like a kind philoſophical father, for fear they ſhould want after his death, he ſends them to the poor-houſe during his lifetime! To conclude, the philoſopher dies, and leaves the philoſopheress, his wife, to the protection

protection of a friend; ſhe marries a footman, and gets turned out into the ſtreet.

This is a brief ſketch of the life of Jean Jacques Rouſſeau, the oracle of the regenerated French: a thief, a whoremaſter, an adulterer, a treacherous friend, an unnatural father, and twice an apoſtate. There want only about a hundred murders to make him equal to the immortal Marat, whom we have ſeen compared to Jeſus Chriſt. This vile wretch has the impudence to ſay, in the work that contains a confeſſion of theſe his crimes, that no man can come to the throne of God and ſay, *I am a better man than Rouſſeau.*

His writings, though they have very great literary merit, contain ſuch principles as might be expected from ſuch a man: he has exhauſted all the powers of reaſoning and all the charms of eloquence in the cauſe of anarchy and irreligion: and his writings are ſo much the more dangerous, as he winds himſelf into favour with the unwary, by an eternal cant about *virtue* and *liberty*. He ſeems to have aſſumed the maſk of virtue for no other purpoſe than that of propagating with more certain ſucceſs the blackeſt and moſt incorrigible vice *.

This

* Two philoſophers can ſeldom agree more than two perſons of any other profeſſion: ſo it happened with *Voltaire* and *Rouſſeau*. The humorous prophetic ſatire of the former, occaſioned by the publication of *Rouſſeau*'s romance, the *New Eloiſa*, is ſo well worthy of a place here, that I cannot deny myſelf the pleaſure of tranſlating an extract or two from it.

"In thoſe days there will appear in France a wonderful man. He will ſay unto the people, Behold, I am poſſeſſed by the demon of enthuſiaſm; I have received from Heaven the gift of paradoxical inconſiſtency; and the light-heeled multitude will dance after him, and many will adore him. And he will ſay, You are all raſcals and proſtitutes, and I deteſt raſcals and proſtitutes, and I come to live amongſt you. And he will add, The men and women are all virtuous in the republic of Geneva, where I was born; and I love virtuous men and women, and I will not live in the country where

This was the man and the writer that the Conſtituent Aſſembly held up to the imitation and even adoration of the poor deluded French people. The aſhes of this thieving philoſopher coſt the nation almoſt two thouſand guineas in debates.

Thoſe who know what power novelty has on the French, with what enthuſiaſm, or rather fury, they adopt whatever is in vogue, may gueſs at the effect that this philoſophical canonization of Rouſſeau produced. Every thing was *à la Rouſſeau*; his works were hawked about, mouthed in the National Aſſembly (often by thoſe who underſtood them not), recommended in all the prints, and ſpouted at the ſans-culotte clubs. His old booriſh ſayings became the liveliеſt traits of wit—all his manners were imitated; to be cruſty and ill-bred was like Jean Jacques; and, what was particularly offenſive to every juſt mind, his loathſome down-looking portrait, that portrait which ſeems to be the choſen ſeat of guilt, was ſeen at every corner and in every hand.

Having thus prepared the public mind, the Aſſembly made a bold attack on the Church. They diſcovered, by the light of philoſophy, that France contained too many churches, and, of courſe, too

---

where I was born. He will proteſt that the playhouſe is a ſchool of proſtitution and corruption; and he will write operas and plays. He will adviſe mankind to go ſtark-naked, and he will wear laced clothes when given unto him. He will ſwear that romances corrupt the morals of all who read them, and he will compoſe a romance; and in this romance will be ſeen vice in deeds and virtue in words, and the lovers will be mad with love and with philoſophy; and this romance will teach how to ſeduce a young girl philoſophically; and the diſciple will loſe all ſhame and modeſty: and ſhe will practiſe fooliſhneſs, and raiſe maxims and paradoxes with her maſter; and ſhe will kiſs firſt, and aſk him to lie with her, and he will actually lie with her, and ſhe will become round and pregnant with metaphyſics. And this they will call philoſophy and virtue; and they will talk about philoſophy and virtue till no ſoul on earth will know what philoſophy and virtue is."

many paſtors. Great part of them were therefore to be ſuppreſſed, and, to make the innovation go down with the people, all tithes were to be aboliſhed. The meaſures ſucceeded; but what did the people gain by the abolition of the tithes? Not a farthing; for a tax of twenty per cent. was immediately laid on the lands in conſequence of it. The cheat was not perceived till it was too late.

But the abolition of the tithes, the only motive of which was to debaſe the Clergy in the opinions of the people, was but a trifle to what was to follow. The religious orders, that is to ſay, the communities of monks and nuns, poſſeſſed immenſe landed eſtates, and theſe the honeſt Aſſembly had marked for their own. As a pretext for the ſeizure, they firſt decreed that the wealth of the religious orders belonged to the nation, to that indefinite being that exiſts every where and no where, and that has devoured all without receiving any thing.

As this act of ſeizing the eſtates of the regular clergy was one of thoſe that gave a deciſive blow to the property as well as religion in France, and one that has received the greateſt applauſes in this country, I ſhall enter a little at length on the flagrant injuſtice of it. Nor is the ſubject inapplicable to ourſelves; for, though there are no religious orders in America, there are many people of property; and it is of a violation of property that I here charge the Aſſembly.

How the eſtates of the religious orders became the property of a certain ſomebody called the nation, in 1791, is to me wholly inconceivable, ſeeing that there never was a time when they belonged to that ſociety of men now called the French. Great part of the monaſteries had been founded five, ſix, ſeven hundred years, and ſome above a thouſand years, before the moſt worthleſs of the French took it into their heads to be ſo many ſovereigns. The founders were

were men of pious and auſtere lives, who, wiſhing to retire from the world, obtained grants of uncultivated land, generally in ſome barren and ſolitary ſpot. There they formed little miſerable ſettlements, which, by their frugality and labour, in time became rich meadows, farms, and vineyards. A French hiſtorian, ſpeaking of St. Etienne, ſays: "In 1058 he retired to Citeaux, then a vaſt foreſt, "inhabited only by wild beaſts. Here, with the "help of his followers, he built a monaſtery of the "wood of the foreſt; but, at firſt, it was no more "than a group of ſhabby huts. Every thing bore "the marks of extreme poverty: the croſs was of "wood, the cenſers of copper, and the candleſticks "of iron. All the ornaments were of coarſe woollen "or linen. Labour was the only means of ſubſiſtence with the monks of Citeaux. For many "years bread was their only food, and they were "often reduced to a ſcarcity of even that."

In time this foreſt became a cultivated and flouriſhing eſtate, and the ſucceſſors of the firſt proprietors were not only at their eaſe, but even rich. The monaſtery, which was at firſt but a clump of ill-ſhaped huts, built with the limbs of trees, bark, and turf, was become a magnificent pile. The church was beautiful beyond deſcription. Inſtead of wood, and copper, and iron, the ſymbols of religion and the ſacred vaſes were now of gold, ſilver, and precious ſtones. This abbey, at the time of the ſeizure by the Conſtituent Aſſembly, had an annual revenue of 120,000 French livres, or about 6000 pounds ſterling.

Now I aſk any honeſt man, was this the property of the French nation, or not? By what rule of right, by what principle of law or juſtice, could this eſtate belong to any other than the *lawful* ſucceſſors of the firſt proprietors; that is to ſay, the poſſeſſors at the epoch of the ſeizure? No title ever

framed by man could be ſo good as theirs. The community at Citeaux had never ceaſed to exiſt, nor for a ſingle moment ceaſed to keep poſſeſſion of their abbey and its dependencies. They had firſt obtained a lawful grant of the land, had cleared, cultivated, and enriched it, and had enjoyed an uninterrupted poſſeſſion during the ſpace of ſeven hundred and thirty-two years; but, at the end of the *enlightened* eighteenth century, the *Age of Reaſon*, up ſtarts a horde of lazy, worthleſs ruffians, calling themſelves the nation, and lay claim to their eſtates!

Bulteau, in ſpeaking of St. Benedict, ſays: "The "bodily labour ordered by this wiſe founder, was a "ſource of peace and tranquillity to the firſt monks, "and of opulence to their ſucceſſors. The monaſ- "teries were long an aſylum to thoſe Chriſtians who "fled from the oppreſſions of the Goths and Van- "dals. The little learning that remained in the "barbarous and dark ages was preſerved in the cloiſ- "ters. It is to them we owe all the moſt precious "remains of antiquity, as well as many modern in- "ventions." Indeed, under the great Diſpoſer of all events, it is to them we owe that we are Chriſtians; that we poſſeſs the word of God, our guide to eternal life. They not only preſerved this ineſtimable volume, but ſpread it in every country in the world. Without their agency, our anceſtors might have continued Pagans; nay, we ourſelves, perhaps, might now have been ſacrificing our children in the hollow of a wicker idol. Every man of any reading knows, that the monaſteries have continued to enrich the world with learned and uſeful productions. Some of the writings that do the greateſt honour to the French nation, and to the human mind, have iſſued from the cloiſter. And yet we have ſeen theſe men robbed of their eſtates, ſtripped of even their furniture and their veſtments, driven from beneath their roofs, hunted like wild beaſts; and, what

I am

I am aſhamed to ſay, many of us have had the folly, or rather baſeneſs, to applaud their unprincipled and blood-thirſty purſuers *.

We are told that the monks were become too rich. Indeed this was their great offence in the eyes of an Aſſembly, whoſe motto was, "War to the rich, "and peace to the cottager." But we have ſeen that the foundation of theſe riches was laid by the labour of their predeceſſors, and we may obſerve that they were augmented, not by oppreſſion, as has been falſely aſſerted, but by a prudent management of their eſtates. Thoſe communities that cultivated their own lands, were noted for the excellent manner of their cultivation, and for the ſuperior quality of their produce; and thoſe that rented out their farms let them at a low rate, ſo as to enable the farmer to enrich the land at the ſame time that he enriched himſelf. It was by ſuch means that their eſtates became the moſt valuable in the country; a circumſtance that poor ſhallow-headed Paine has

* I cannot help obſerving here, that theſe unjuſt and inhuman applaudèrs have not always been confined to the mob. "An *Oration* on the *Progreſs of Reaſon*," delivered at a public commencement in the Univerſity of Cambridge, Maſſachuſetts, on the 18th of July, 1792, contains a philippic againſt the injured French Monarch and Clergy, the moſt illiberal that ever diſgraced the lips of a petulant, ſelf-ſufficient pedant. The *Orator* diſcovers but little knowledge of any branch of his ſubject, and more particularly of the character of Louis XVI. of that of the French Clergy, and of the nature of the old Government; againſt all which he runs on in a ſtrain of invective, more reſembling the brutal abuſiveneſs of Calvin, than any thing we ought to expect to hear from the chair of a ſeminary, at the cloſe of the *enlightened* eighteenth century. Like many others, this *Orator* looked upon the French revolution as happily terminated; as the dawn of univerſal peace, liberty, and virtue: he has ſince had time to ſee his error, to ſee the effects of his "Progreſs of Reaſon," ſome of which I have related in the former part of this tract; if he be candid, therefore, he will publicly retract this error. If he ſhould not do this, I ſhall take the liberty, one of theſe days, of convincing him that he has erred.

brought againſt them as a heinous offence. They were gentle, humane maſters and landlords: a man looked upon his fortune as made, when he became the tenant of a religious order.

And how were theſe riches ſpent? Not in horſes and coaches: people ſhut up in a cloiſter had no uſe for theſe. Not in balls and plays; for there they could never appear. Not in rich attire and coſtly repaſts; for the greater part of them were clothed worſe than common beggars, and were forbidden the uſe of meat, and even of wine, the common drink of their country. Their riches did not go to aggrandize their families; becauſe, as no individual could poſſeſs any thing, ſo he could bequeath or diſpoſe of nothing. Who, then, profited from theſe riches? Go aſk the poor, who were happy in the neighbourhood of their convents. Go aſk the aged, the infirm, the widow, and the orphan; and aſk them too, what aid and conſolation they have received from the thieving philoſophers of the revolution.

This charge of being *too rich*, is the moſt abſurd as well as the moſt vile that could poſſibly be invented. Do we ſay to a man, who has acquired an immenſe fortune by the labour of his father, or by any other means, You are *too rich*, and therefore your property belongs to the nation? There is a community at Bethlem, very much reſembling thoſe we have been ſpeaking of. What ſhould we think of a ſcoundrel legiſlator, who ſhould propoſe to ſtrip theſe people of their property, and turn them out to beg their bread, merely becauſe the value of their lands is increaſed? Such was he who firſt propoſed the ſeizure of the church lands in France.

Some of the convents in France had been founded by lay perſons, upon ſuch and ſuch conditions; and in caſe of failure on the part of the community, the property was to revert to the heirs of the donor.—Foundations of this kind were exactly reſembling thoſe

thoſe we frequently ſee among us, of hoſpitals, ſeminaries, &c. and the deeds were ſtill in exiſtence at the time of the ſeizure; but an Aſſembly that paid no reſpect to a right of preſcription, founded on a thouſand years of uninterrupted poſſeſſion, could not be expected to pay attention to the contents of a bit of old parchment.

We ought not to be aſtoniſhed at hearing the author of *The Age of Reaſon* attempt to juſtify this act of impudent fraud; but let us ſee how his doctrine would ſuit, if applied to ourſelves: for this is the only way to determine on its merits. Suppoſe (which God forbid!) the principles of the French revolution ſhould be adopted by our Legiſlature, and they ſhould declare all the meeting-houſes, ſeminaries, hoſpitals, &c. together with the eſtates which have been left for their ſupport, *the property of the nation*; how ſhould we receive this? Suppoſe an army of cut-throats ſhould be ſent to the Friends' meeting-houſe, and thruſt them out with the point of the bayonet; ſuppoſe another ſhould go to the epiſcopal church, drive the congregation from the altar, ſtrip the miniſter of his caſſock, ſeize on the ſacramental cup, and turn the church into a ſtable; I aſk, how ſhould we like this?—But, we are told, there is a vaſt difference; that the monks were ſuperſtitious drones, uſeleſs to ſociety. Ah! let us beware. Let us take care not to condemn, becauſe we are Proteſtants, a religion that differs from our own in form only; a religion that has yet more votaries than any other Chriſtian profeſſion can boaſt of. And as to the religious orders being uſeleſs to ſociety, we have no proofs of this, but ſtrong preſumptive ones to the contrary; for we know that France was great and happy, that it had been increaſing in extent, wealth, and population, ſince the exiſtence of thoſe communities. However, I can by no means take upon me to prove the public utility of the monaſtic life; nor

is it neceſſary; for if no man is to poſſeſs property, unleſs he can prove his utility to ſociety, I am afraid that few of us would be ſecure. How many hundreds of proprietors do we ſee, who are much *worſe* than uſeleſs to ſociety! Surely the public is as much benefited by a man who ſpends his life in a convent, as by one who ſpends it in a tavern, at a billiard-table, or in a playhouſe. Thouſands and thouſands there are who never worked a ſtroke nor ſtudied a ſingle hour; vegetating mortals, who ſeem to live only to eat and drink, and be carried about. Yet we have never thought of ſeizing their eſtates. No; utility, or inutility, has nothing to do with the matter; the queſtion before us is a ſimple queſtion of right—Whether monks were neceſſary or uſeful in France, or not? We know there were ſuch people, and that they poſſeſſed property legally acquired; and every honeſt man, capable of diſtinguiſhing between right and wrong, will hold in abhorrence the Aſſembly that dared to rob them of it.

When we hear of ſuch crying acts of injuſtice as this, we are naturally led to inquire who were the firſt promoters of them. The reader will be aſtoniſhed to hear, that the decree for this national robbery was firſt propoſed by a Biſhop. Of a hundred and thirty-eight French Biſhops, there were only four to be found who would give their approbation to this deed, and one of theſe four was he who propoſed the decree. The Abbé Barruel ſpeaks of him in the following terms: "The Aſſembly thought it "high time to conſummate their deſigns upon the "Church, by ſeizing what ſtill remained of its "poſſeſſions. This meaſure was ſo evidently con-"trary to every principle of juſtice and common ho-"neſty, that it was not eaſy to find a man ſo totally "loſt to every ſentiment of humanity as to bring it "forward. This ſecond Judas was at laſt found in "the College of the Apoſtles. This was Talleyrand "Perigord,

" Perigord, Biſhop of Autun. This Perigord poſ-
" ſeſſed all the baſeneſs, all the vices of a Jew."—
See Hiſt. of the French Clergy, page 15.

To obtain the ſanction of the people to this act, they were told that the wealth of the Church would not only pay off the national debt, but render taxes in future unneceſſary. No deception was ever ſo barefaced as this; but even this was not wanted; for the people themſelves had already begun to taſte the ſweets of plunder. Avarice tempted the trading part of the nation to approve of the meaſure. At the time of paſſing the decree they were ſeen among the firſt to applaud it. They ſaw an eaſy mean of obtaining thoſe fine rich eſtates, the poſſeſſion of which they had, perhaps, long coveted. In vain they were told, that the purchaſer would partake in the infamy of the robbery; that, if the title of the communities could not render property ſecure, that ſame property could never be ſecure under any title the plunderers could give. In vain were they told, that in ſanctioning the ſeizure of the wealth of others, they were ſanctioning the ſeizure of their own, whenever that all-devouring monſter, the ſovereign people, ſhould call on them for it. In vain were they told all this; they purchaſed; they ſaw with pleaſure the plundered Clergy driven from their dwellings; but ſcarcely had they taken poſſeſſion of their ill-gotten wealth, when not only that, but the remains of their other property, were wrenched from them. Since that we have ſeen decree upon decree launched forth againſt the rich: their account-books have been ſubmitted to public examination; they have been obliged to give drafts for the funds they poſſeſſed even in foreign countries; all their letters have been intercepted and read. How many hundreds of them have we ſeen led to the ſcaffold, merely becauſe they were proprietors of what their ſovereign ſtood in need of! Theſe were acts of unexampled

exampled tyranny; but as they reſpected the perſons who applauded the ſeizure of the eſtates of the Church, they were *perfectly juſt*. Several of theſe avaricious purchaſers have been murdered within the walls of thoſe buildings, whence they had aſſiſted to drive the lawful proprietors: this was *juſt:* it was the meaſure they had meted to others. They ſhared the fate of the injured Clergy, without ſharing the pity which that fate excited. When dragged forth to ſlaughter in their turn, they were left without even the right of complaining: the laſt ſtab of the aſſaſſin was accompanied with the cutting reflection that it was *juſt*.

I have dwelt the longer on this ſubject, as it is, perhaps, the moſt ſtriking and moſt awful example of the conſequences of a violation of property, that the world ever ſaw. Let it ſerve to warn all thoſe who wiſh to raiſe their fortunes on the ruin of others, that ſooner or later their own turn muſt come. From this act of the Conſtituent Aſſembly we may date the violation, in France, of every right that men ought to hold dear. Hence the ſeizure of all the gold and ſilver, as the property of the nation; hence the law preventing the ſon to claim the wealth of his father; hence the abominable tyranny of requiſitions; and hence thouſands and thouſands of the murders that have diſgraced unhappy France.

Since the ſeizure of the Church eſtates there has not, in fact, been any ſuch thing as private property in France; for, though the Conſtituent Aſſembly did not paſs a decree of this import, they knew perfectly well how to paſs decrees and eſtabliſh regulations amounting to the ſame thing. Some of their enormous contributions on the rich were called *patriotic gifts*; but he who refuſed to pay the *gifts* inſerted in the liſt, knew he had but a few hours to live. The money and jewels depoſited at the bar of the Aſſembly and on the altar of the country, amounted to

to immenſe ſums. Theſe were held out as a proof of a general approbation of their meaſures; but had the Aſſembly been candid, they would have confeſſed that theſe offerings were the pure effect of fear, of a panic that had ſeized all the proprietors in the nation, and that each giver's hatred to their cauſe might be meaſured by the ſum he depoſited. It was not a grateful free-will offering, but a ſacrifice that the trembling wretch came to offer at the ſhrine of tyranny, in order to ſave his houſe from the flames, or his own head, or that of ſome dear relation or parent, from the ſcaffold. Could a man, reduced to acts like this, be ſaid to poſſeſs any thing?

The ſucceſſors of the Conſtituent Aſſembly laid aſide the maſk, as no longer neceſſary. On the 13th of March, 1794, all the merchants of Bourdeaux (known for one of the moſt infamouſly patriotic towns in the kingdom) were arreſted in one day, and condemned, in preſence of the guillotine, to a fine of *one hundred millions* of French livres, upwards of *four* millions ſterling. On the 18th of April, the rich Banker, La Borde, after having *purchaſed his life eight times*, was guillotined, and the remainder of his riches confiſcated. On the 10th of May, twenty-ſeven rich Farmers-general were executed, becauſe they had amaſſed riches under the monarchy. Finally, on the 27th of June, all property, of whatever deſcription, was decreed *to belong to the nation*, and was put in a ſtate of requiſition accordingly, as the *perſons* of the whole of the inhabitants had been before.

The milk-and-water admirers of the Conſtituent Aſſembly pretend to be ſhocked at theſe meaſures; but what are theſe meaſures more than an improvement on thoſe of that Aſſembly? The progreſs was not only natural, but even neceſſary to the ſupport of the revolution. Had there been ſtill Church eſtates to ſeize, and monks to murder, it is probable that the tyrants who have ſucceeded the Conſtituent

ent Aſſembly, would not have ſurpaſſed their predeceſſors; but that ſource being exhauſted, they were obliged to find out others, or return to order and obedience. And I ſhould be glad to know, if the property of one individual, or one ſociety, was become the property of the ſovereign people by virtue of a decree of one Aſſembly, why the ſame claim ſhould not be made to the property of other individuals, or other ſocieties. Nor can I believe, whatever atheiſts and deiſts may ſay to the contrary, that it was any more unjuſt to guillotine bankers and merchants, or even members of the Conſtituent Aſſembly, than to guillotine or maſſacre poor, defenceleſs, friendleſs prieſts. There is ſuch an intimate connexion between the ſecurity of property, and that of the perſon to whom that property belongs, that one can never be ſaid to be ſafe, while the other is in danger. Tyrant princes, tyrant aſſemblies, or tyrant mobs, when once they are ſuffered to take away with impunity the property of the innocent man, will feel little ſcruple at taking away his life alſo. Robbery and murder are the natural auxiliaries of each other; and, with a people rendered ferocious and hardened by an infidel ſyſtem, that removes all fear of an hereafter, they muſt for ever be inſeparable.

Before the decree was paſſed for the aſſumption of the eſtates of the regular Clergy, every calumny that falſehood could invent, and every vexation that tyranny could enforce, were employed to debaſe the whole body of the Clergy, and the religion they taught. Songs and caricatures were ſung, or hawked about, by ſhameleſs ſtrumpets in the pay of the Aſſembly. In theſe not only the clerical functions, and the lives of the Clergy, were ridiculed, but even the life of Jeſus Chriſt and the Virgin Mary. The incarnation of our Saviour became the ſubject of a *farce*, in the ſmutty language of Pariſian fiſhwomen.

Who

Who were the characters in this farce, I leave the ſhuddering reader to conceive.

A decree, in form of an *invitation**, was iſſued, for bringing the gold and ſilver from the churches to the mint. It was well known, that there were none of theſe metals in the churches, except the vaſes, the crucifixes, and other ſymbols, hitherto held ſacred. What an effect the coining up of theſe muſt have on the minds of the giddy multitude, is not difficult to imagine. Many, however, even of the moſt depraved, felt a momentary horror; but this horror the Aſſembly knew how to do away. Hundreds, I might ſay thouſands of abandoned ſcribblers were employed to propagate the new principles. Their little filthy ditties were ſpread through all the departments, at the expenſe of the nation. Some of theſe were catechiſms in rhyme, in which the Conſtitution was ſubſtituted for God, the Aſſembly for the ſaints, and both recommended to the adoration of the French patriots. The Journal, or Letter, as it was called, of Père du Chêne, written by one Hebert, and of which, it is ſaid, fifty thouſand copies were ſtruck off daily, was ſent into the towns and villages by the carriers of the decrees of the Aſſembly. This Hebert, whoſe ſtrumpet has ſince been adored at Paris as the Goddeſs of Reaſon, was a profeſſed atheiſt. His journal contained the moſt outrageous abuſe of all that was reſpectable and ſacred, interlarded with oaths and execrations without number. I have one now before me, which has for title: "*Lettre du veritable Père du Chêne, bougrement Patriotic*"—in Engliſh: "Letter of the true

* "Invitations from ſuperiors," ſays ſome one, "ſavour "ſtrongly of commands." This was ſo much the caſe in the preſent inſtance, that the prieſt who dared to diſobey, was ſure to expiate his diſobedience with his life. The magiſtrates often entered the church and ſeized the chalices on the altar, during the celebration of the maſs. Such are revolutionary *invitations!*

"Father

" Father du Chêne, b—gerly patriotic." I would here inſert an extract from this letter; but I truſt I ſhall be believed, when I ſay, the contents are fully anſwerable to the title. Such were the agents of Condorcet and his colleagues: thus did they corrupt the morals of the people; thus did they lead them from one degree of vice to another; thus were they hardened up to rob and to murder: and thus did the boaſted Conſtituent Aſſembly lay the foundation of all thoſe horrors we have ſince heard of.

The magiſtrates in the different municipalities, choſen from the ſcum of the nation, diſtributed theſe infernal writings among the people in their precincts, and particularly among the young people. If, by chance, ſome magiſtrate was found too ſcrupulous to execute their will, means were ſoon invented to get rid of him. Some pretext or other was never wanting to excite the mob to put an end to him and his reſiſtance. Chatel, Mayor of St. Denys, was one of this deſcription. The mob were told that this man was the cauſe of the dearneſs of bread. They flew to his houſe, and obliged him to reduce the price according to their will, though it was well known that he had not the power to reduce it at all, unleſs at his own expenſe. The rabble were diſperſing, but they had not fulfilled the bloody wiſhes of the revolutionary agents, who had nothing leſs in view than the lowering of the price of bread. They were inſtigated to return to the unfortunate magiſtrate. Firſt they attempted to hang him; but, wearied with his reſiſtance, one of them took out his knife, and cut his head partly off, while ſeveral others pricked him with their bayonets. The unhappy victim was ſtill alive after the back of his neck was cut aſunder, and was heard to groan out, "*For Heaven's ſake kill* "*me! kill me! you make me ſuffer too long!*" The ſanguinary villain, who had begun to cut his head off, now threw away his knife, and borrowed that

of

of his comrade, with which he finiſhed the work. When he found that his own knife was not ſufficient, he ſaid with a cool indifference, "*Lend me your "knife, for mine is not worth a curſe.*" That which was lent him, was a little twopenny knife with a wooden handle. During this time, other aſſaſſins gave him ſeveral ſtabs with their knives in the belly and ſtomach: one of them turned his knife ſlowly in the flank of the dying man, and ſaid to him, laughing, "*Does that enter well? Don't you find the "daylight peep into you?*"—He at laſt expired, after the moſt inconceivable torments. His body was dragged along the ſtreets of St. Denys, with his head tied to his feet. A reſolution of the town has ſince declared him *innocent of any offence whatever:* he had given abundant aſſiſtance to the poor the winter before: the diminution he had juſt made in the price of bread was at his own expenſe; and this barbarous puniſhment was his recompenſe. His wife went diſtracted, and has ever ſince been in a madhouſe. His aſſaſſins obtained pardon from the Aſſembly; a circumſtance much leſs ſurpriſing than that they ſhould think it neceſſary to aſk it.—See Du Cour's Memoire, page 57.

Examples of this kind, and ſuch were wanting in very few parts of the country, could not fail to enſure an implicit obedience on the part of the magiſtrates.

The debaſement of religion was nearly completed by the public ſale of the ſuppreſſed churches and monaſteries. The groſſeſt indecency preſided at all theſe demoniac ſcenes. When the vile agent of the Aſſembly, hammer in hand, had exhauſted his auctioneer rhetoric, in recommending a church as an excellent barn, ſtable, or playhouſe, it was knocked down to the baſe and avaricious ſpeculator, while the hireling mob ſhouted applauſe. The church of Aldegone, at St. Omer's (I love to cite inſtances),

the higheſt in that ancient town, and for hundreds of years the pride of its inhabitants, was ſold to a *Jew* of Dunkirk, for the pitiful ſum of 20,000 French livres in aſſignats, not more than 200 pounds ſterling, nor half the coſt of one of the pillars. This beautiful edifice, by the ſpire of which the town was known at a great diſtance, had been choſen for deſtruction, that the humiliation of religion might be the more ſtriking. It met with ſuch treatment as might be expected from the hands of an infidel. Its lofty ſpire was tumbled to the earth in leſs than a month; the body of the church was turned into a rope-walk; and the Jew proprietor, to complete the degradation of Chriſtianity, left a repreſentation of the Lord's Supper uneffaced in the chancel. What muſt be the grief, what the indignation of the thinking and pious part of the inhabitants of St. Omer's, thus to ſee their favourite church, the ſanctuary of their God, and the God of their fathers, delivered, for a bundle of depreciated paper-money, into the hands of a deſcendant of the murderers of Him to whoſe worſhip it was conſecrated!

To give the reader a juſt idea of the ribaldry, of the ſcenes of brutal impiety, exhibited at the pillage of the convents, is totally impoſſible. A dozen or two of carts rattling along with a Commiſſary at their head, followed by an eſcort of raggamuffins, decorated with a bit of three-coloured riband, and armed with hammers, axes, crow-bars, and ſpades, generally formed the corps for ſuch an expedition. Hardly were the doors opened, when the vaults rang with their hammering and their oaths. In a few hours the whole was gutted. The decorations of the altar, the prieſts' veſtments, ſtatues, pictures, books, manuſcripts, the moſt precious pieces of antiquity, the productions of long and laborious lives of ſtudy, were hauled away as ſo much rubbiſh. The paintings on the doors, walls, ceilings,

and other fixtures, were effaced or disfigured: the fury of the enlightened ruffians defcended even to the graves of the deceafed fathers.

At the expulfion of the nuns, the conduct of the revolutionifts was, if poffible, ftill more fwinifh and cruel. While the gibing Commiffary pulled afide their veils to examine their faces, his black-guard attendants congratulated them on the *pleafures* they were going to enjoy in the world, and this in a language calculated to raife a bluſh on the cheek of a common ſtreet-walker. They ſeemed to enjoy their tears, and even to make ſome ſacrifices to augment them. Had any one a piece of needle-work which ſhe wiſhed to preſerve, it was rent to pieces before her face. A ſinging-bird that had the misfortune to have been the companion of the ſolitary hours of its miſtreſs, was ſure to be taken from her and killed. To theſe dejected and defenceleſs females every inſult and indignity was offered, not forgetting the laſt of which beaſtly libertines can be guilty.

In a country where the crucifix was ſent to the mint; where churches were put up at auction; where the half-worn caſſock, the ſurplice, and the veil, made part of the aſſortment of a dealer in old clothes, and were expoſed to public ſale on the market-place; where the miniſters of the Goſpel were ſcoffed at, reviled, and frequently murdered with as little ceremony as one would kill a dog; where the moſt daring blaſphemies were uttered and publiſhed, and ſpread through the country, not only with the permiſſion of its governors, but by their direction; in a country where all this was practiſed, religion could not be of long duration. Religion, and even the Catholic religion, did, however, ſtill ſubſiſt in France, at leaſt in *form*. The Aſſembly had as yet paſſed no poſitive decree for its abolition. They had robbed the Church, had ſtrip-

ped its altars, and degraded its miniſters; but ſtill the moſt pious and active of thoſe miniſters were left in the exerciſe of their functions. The parochial Clergy, though deprived of the tithes, had a ſtipend allowed them. They yet remained with their pariſhioners, many of whom, indeed nearly all the elderly and ſober part of them, continued as firmly attached to their paſtors, as at any former period.

Things were not ſuffered to remain long in this ſtate. The Conſtituent Aſſembly well knew, that they and religion could never exiſt for any length of time in the ſame country. The parochial Clergy were men of talents and induſtry. They generally decided all the little diſputes between their pariſhioners; to which amiable capacity they often joined that of phyſician or ſurgeon; and theſe their beneficent ſervices were always rendered without fee or reward. Even the atheiſts and deiſts themſelves had repeatedly acknowledged their virtuous modeſty, and the great utility they were of to the community at large. Such a body of men, immoveably attached to the religion they taught, was truly formidable to the new tyrants. Religion had received a ſevere blow; but if theſe men retained their cures, it might recover. Nay, what was ſtill more dreadful, the monarchy itſelf might recover along with it; and it is not difficult to conceive, how an idea like this muſt haunt the minds of the pupils of the ſavage and imperious Diderot, who hoped to ſee "the laſt of kings ſtrangled with the "guts of the laſt of prieſts." In ſhort, the parochial Clergy were the only men on earth they had now to fear, and theſe they got rid of by a ſtratagem worthy of an Aſſembly, the leaders of which joined to the moſt hardened wickedneſs the profoundeſt diſſimulation.

They

They laid aſide the *Rights of Man*, together with the famous Conſtitution, from which they took the adjunct to their name, and which we have ſince ſeen burnt by the hands of the common hangman (or rather common guillotiner), in that very city of Paris, where it had been iſſued amidſt the applauſes, and even adorations of the populace. They laid aſide the diſcuſſion of this inſtrument of ſhortlived and ridiculous memory, to draw up another, which they were pleaſed to call "the Civic Conſtitution of the Clergy." They were conſtitution-mad, abſolutely frantic.

It might be ſufficient to ſay of this latter conſtitution, that it was juſt as ſubverſive of religion as the other conſtitution was of every principle of government and ſound policy. They knew it to be in direct oppoſition to the very nature of the Catholic religion: yet they had the aſſurance to tell the people, that it was not; they even went ſo far as to proteſt, that they would live and die in the religion of their forefathers, at the very moment when they were taking the ſureſt meaſure in the world for deſtroying it. They were led to this hypocritical declaration from a fear that the body of the people were not yet ripe for a total abolition of religion; and, as we ſhall ſee in the ſequel, this fear was not entirely unfounded. By perſuading the people that nothing was intended againſt their faith, they had an additional handle againſt the Clergy, by repreſenting them as unfriendly to their "Civil Conſtitution," merely becauſe it was neceſſary to the ſupport of the *Rights of Man*.

This inſtrument did not, however, paſs into a law without conſiderable reſiſtance. There were yet ſome honeſt and virtuous men even among the members of the Conſtituent Aſſembly. Theſe had remained with them, not to aid in overturning the Government, and effecting the dreadful revolution

that has ſince rendered the country a ſlaughter-houſe, but to oppoſe the deſtructive meaſures of the philoſophers, and, if poſſible, ſave the ſinking ſtate. At the head of theſe was the learned and eloquent Abbé Maury. He oppoſed this "Civil Conſtitution," with all the powers of reaſoning and all the charms of eloquence: but it was caſting pearls before ſwine. When was an atheiſt open to conviction? The decree paſſed, and was ſoon after followed by another, obliging the Clergy to ſwear to obſerve and maintain the "Civil Conſtitution." This oath they could not take without breaking that which they had taken at entering into the prieſthood; and that the Aſſembly had every reaſon to ſuppoſe they would not do. Whether they did or not, however, the end of their tyrants was anſwered: if they refuſed, they were to be driven from their livings; if they complied, they muſt be looked upon as apoſtates, and be deſerted by all thoſe who were ſtill attached to them. In either caſe the tottering remains of religion muſt come to the ground. The Clergy, and indeed the whole nation, and all Europe, ſaw the real object of this inhuman and impious decree; but the Aſſembly, ſurrounded with their *enlightened* myrmidons, the Pariſian mob, bid defiance to earth and Heaven.

Generally ſpeaking, the Clergy were reſolved not to take the oath. "Loſe no time," ſaid the Abbé Maury, "in the delivery of your challenge. By "ſhedding our blood, you may ingratiate your-"ſelves with your conſtituents. Loſe, then, not "a ſingle moment. Your victims are here; they "are ready. To their torments add not that of "ſuſpenſe. Why not vote at once for our execu-"tion, glut your hatred, and quench for a little "your thirſt for blood? Haſten, I ſay, while the "power is in your hands; for remember, I now "foretel, *your reign will be of ſhort duration.*"

This prophetic addreſs, which we have ſeen ſo fully verified, ſerved only to inflame. Eight days only were given the Clergy to determine on compliance or refuſal, during which no ſtratagem that baſe and degenerate tyranny could deviſe, was left uneſſayed to intimidate them. This was ever their practice, when they had an important blow to ſtrike. Rochefoucault, formerly a duke, declared, at the time the decree for the ſeizure of the monaſteries was under deliberation, that "*the lives of the biſhops* "*and prieſts, in the Aſſembly, depended upon the* "*paſſing of it*;" and, in order to ſilence all thoſe who oppoſed it, a liſt of their names was ſtuck up on the walls, with a promiſe of a reward of "twelve hundred livres *to any patriot who would aſ-* "*faſſinate them.*"—According to this laudable cuſtom, this inſtance of French liberty, when the day for taking the oath, or, as it was well termed, "the forſwearing day," arrived, the Aſſembly took care to call in the aid of the fiſhwomen and mob. "*To the lamp-poſt with the nonjuring biſhops and* "*prieſts!*" was echoed from the ſtreets and the galleries. The ruffians were prepared for murder, and were howling for their prey, like ſo many wolves round a ſheepfold.

Let the reader imagine himſelf in the ſituation of one of theſe unfortunate clergymen; an oath of apoſtacy before him, and a halter behind his back; and then let him give me his opinion of the *Rights of Man.*

This did not intimidate the Clergy; only thirty of whom could be prevailed on to ſubmit, and theſe were already known to have abandoned their religion. When the oath was tendered to the Biſhop of Agen, "Gentlemen," ſays he, "I lament, not "the loſs of my fortune; but there is another loſs "which I ſhould ever lament, the loſs of your "eſteem and my faith. I could not fail to loſe

" both, if I took the oath now propoſed to me." The old Biſhop of Poictiers, fearing he might loſe ſo fair an opportunity of bearing teſtimony of his ſincerity, advanced to the tribune, and calling on the Preſident to command ſilence; " Gentlemen," ſaid he, " I am ſeventy years old; I have been thirty " years a biſhop: I will never diſgrace my gray hairs " by an oath of apoſtacy." Upon this manly declaration of the reverend old prelate, the Clergy roſe from their ſeats, thanked him for his example, and told the Aſſembly he had expreſſed their unanimous ſentiments.

Not being a Roman Catholic, I hope I ſhall be excuſed, when I freely declare, that I much queſtion, whether the miniſters of any Proteſtant communion, in a moment ſo terrible, ſurrounded with aſſaſſins, and without a ſingle friend, would have ſhown *ſuch* a noble intrepidity. " They have loſt " their money," ſaid the profligate Mirabeau, on this occaſion, " *but they have ſaved their honour* *."

And,

* Doctor Prieſtley (Faſt Sermon of 1794, page 46) ſays, " When I was myſelf in France, in 1774, I ſaw ſufficient reaſon " to believe, that *hardly any perſon of eminence*, in *church* or ſtate, " and eſpecially in the leaſt degree eminent in *philoſophy* or lite- " rature, was a believer in Chriſtianity; and no perſon will ſup- " poſe that there has been any change in favour of Chriſtianity *in* " *the laſt twenty years*."—The Doctor will allow, I ſuppoſe, that biſhops are " perſons of *eminence* in the *church*;" if he does, it will appear that he knew but very little of thoſe of the French church, and that he formed a very raſh opinion (to ſay the beſt of it) concerning their belief in Chriſtianity; for, of *one hundred and thirty-eight* biſhops, only four, namely, Talleyrand, Brienne, Jarante, and Gobet, took the oath of apoſtacy. But, he will ſay, I meant " thoſe *eminent* in *philoſophy* and literature." Ah! eminent in *philoſophy!* here he is right. No, no; not one of the *philoſophical divines* believed in Chriſtianity; they looked upon Chriſt as the Unitarians do; that is, as a ſort of " teacher:" but, to the honour of the French biſhops, there were but four of theſe philoſophers amongſt them. As to the other *hundred and thirty*, if they have not given a proof of their belief, I ſhould be glad to know from

And, if this was the caſe, what had the Aſſembly done? If, to *preſerve honour*, it was neceſſary to refuſe an obedience to their decrees, what ſort of decrees muſt thoſe be?

The Aſſembly were diſconcerted by this firm reſiſtance on the part of the Clergy: they knew the Clergy in general would never take the oath, but they did not imagine that thoſe amongſt themſelves would, amidſt the vociferations of their cannibals, have the courage to give ſuch a poſitive denial. For a moment they felt abaſhed; but they were gone too far to think of retreating. The apoſtate Abbé Gregoire, whom we have ſince ſeen amongſt the organizers of a Pagan feſtival, was, on this occaſion,

---

from the Doctor, what proof he will pleaſe to be ſatisfied with.—Their refuſal to take the oath could be dictated by nothing but their belief in Chriſtianity, and their determination not to diſhonour it. Had not this been the caſe, they would have taken the oaths, and preſerved their fortunes. They were in a country where the mob do not, like thoſe of Birmingham, content themſelves with the execution of an *effigy*; they execute the perſon. Yet they remained at their poſt: they did not *decamp in diſguiſe*. Even if they eſcape the knives of the cut-throats, they know that poverty, beggary, a lingering exiſtence, muſt be the price of their refuſal. They could not *bring an action againſt the city of Paris*: no *damages* are granted by a jury in that country. They could not *preach and prate againſt the Government* with impunity; they could not *transfer their property*, and *emigrate in open day*. There are ſuch things as national guards, municipalities, paſſports, halters, daggers, knives, drowning-boats, and *the rights of man*, in France. We have ſince ſeen ſeveral of theſe biſhops, or men "of eminence "in the church," refuſe, with the bloody poniards at their breaſts, to take this oath. Would they have done this, had they been what Doctor Prieſtley has repreſented them to be?—Would they have done this, had they been atheiſts or deiſts?—Nay, would they have done this, had they been *Unitarians*?—If we are to judge from the conduct of the Doctor, they would not.—I will not take upon me to ſay, that the philoſophical political divine meant to propagate an atrocious calumny by this ſermon of his: I ſhould only obſerve, that the ſermon was preached long after the French biſhops had given theſe undeniable proofs of their faith and ſincerity.

choſen to convince the Clergy, that the oath might be taken, without any violation of their faith. After this, in order to deprive the Clergy of an opportunity of defending their opinions in oppoſition to the oath, they were ordered to advance and take it at once. This decree had no effect: not a man advanced. Now the matter was brought to a point: the decree for enforcing the oath muſt be repealed, or the Clergy muſt be driven from their livings, and thoſe in the Aſſembly from their ſeats. It is hardly neceſſary to ſay that the latter was adopted: one tyrannical meaſure is the natural and inevitable conſequence of another.

A decree was now paſſed for the expulſion of all the nonjuring biſhops and prieſts, and for the chooſing of others in their ſtead. From this day, it may be ſaid, there was no ſuch thing as an eſtabliſhed religion in France. The axe had long been laid to the root of the tree; it was ready to fall, and this ſtroke levelled it with the earth.

Had the diſpute been about this or that tenet; had the oath been impoſed with an intention of exchanging one religion for another, the caſe would have been different; the expulſion might have taken place without any very conſiderable injury to the morals of the people. But the ſtruggle was that of religion againſt irreligion, that of Chriſtianity againſt atheiſm.

It was (I hope it is ſo no longer) the opinion of Doctor Prieſtley, and many other *philoſophical divines*, that *any change whatever* was preferable to the continuation of the Catholic religion in France. There is a paſſage in Moore's Journal, which contains ſo complete an anſwer to every thing theſe gentlemen have advanced on this ſubject, that I am ſurpriſed, conſidering the principles of the Journaliſt, and his companion Lauderdale, that it ever found a place in that volume.

The

The Doctor, being in Abbeville, met with a Proteſtant clergyman, whom he congratulated on the deliverance of himſelf and his brethren from the vexation of Romiſh perſecution. The clergyman ſeemed to lament, that along with the ſpirit of perſecution, that of religion daily diminiſhed. "Upon "which," ſays the Doctor, "I obſerved, that, as "nothing could be more oppoſite to true religion "than a ſpirit of perſecution, the former, it was to "be hoped, would return without the latter; but, "in the mean time, the Proteſtants were happy in "not only being tolerated in the exerciſe of their "religion, but alſo in being rendered capable of "enjoying every privilege and advantage which the "Catholics themſelves enjoy.

"We are not allowed thoſe advantages, reſumed "the clergyman, from any regard they bear to our "religion, but from a total indifference to their "own.

"Whatever may be the cauſe, replied I, the ef-"fect is the ſame with regard to you.

"No, ſaid he, the effect might be better, not "only with reſpect to us, but to all France: for the "ſpirit of perſecution might have diſappeared, "without an indifference for all religion coming in "its place: and in that caſe there would have been "more probability of the true religion gaining "ground; for it is eaſier to draw men from an er-"roneous doctrine to a true one, than to impreſs "the truths of religion on minds which deſpiſe all "religion whatever.

"But though you may not be able to make con-"verts of them, I replied, ſtill you may live happy "among them, in the quiet poſſeſſion of your own "religion, and all your other advantages.

"I doubt it much, reſumed he; being perſuaded "that, in a country where religious ſentiments are "effaced from the minds of the bulk of the people,

"crime,

" crimes of the deepeſt guilt will prevail in ſpite of " all the reſtraints of law."

How fully, alas! has the opinion of this good clergyman been confirmed! Here we ſee a man living upon the ſpot, a Frenchman and a Proteſtant, lamenting the decay of the Catholic religion, and trembling for the conſequences. This man plainly perceived the drift of the philoſophical legiſlators: he ſaw that the deſtruction of all religion was their object, while they pretended to be correcting its abuſes. Very far was he from ſaying with our zealous reformers, " that any change was preferable " to the continuation of popery;" and yet, I think, we ought to allow him to be as much intereſted in a change, and as good a judge of its conveniencies and inconveniencies, as perſons on this ſide the ſea; except, indeed, that he might not be *enlightened* by the rays of modern philoſophy *.

From this digreſſion we muſt return to the ex-

* Some of the French Proteſtants, however, differed widely from this good man. The Calviniſts of Nimes began maſſacreing the Catholics at an early period of the revolution, under the pretext that they were *ariſtocrats*. About ſix hundred perſons, of both ſexes and of all ages, were butchered in their houſes, in the ſtreets and public ſquares, before they could even ſuſpect their danger. Theſe monſters attacked the convent of the Capuchins, forced it open, and purſued the venerable fathers out of their dormitories and cells. Five of them were left weltering in their blood at the altar's foot. One of theſe, a very old man, craved five minutes while he committed his ſoul to God. The cool and deliberate villains granted his requeſt. The intended butcher held a piſtol in one hand, and a watch in the other, and when the five minutes were expired, ſhot him through the head.—*See Hiſt. of the French Clergy, page 71, French edition.*

This fact fully proves that Proteſtants can be as cruel as Catholics. Let us not, then, imagine that we are ſecure from events of this kind, merely becauſe the Catholic religion is not eſtabliſhed here. It was not a zeal for the Calviniſtical religion that led the Proteſtants of Nimes to commit theſe acts of barbarity: their knives were pointed, not againſt Catholics, as ſuch, but as *ariſtocrats*.

pulſed

pulſed Clergy. The pariſh prieſts generally followed the example of their biſhops in refuſing to take their oath. Others were, of courſe, appointed to replace them. *Talleyrand Perigord*, whom we have ſeen propoſing the aſſumption of the Church eſtates, was now become a ſort of Pope to the modern Church, and was buſily employed laying *unholy hands* on the heads of the new biſhops. *Gobet*, one of the four biſhops who had forſworn themſelves, was rewarded for his apoſtacy by the biſhopric of Paris. Vagabond philoſophical abbés, who had never been able to obtain admittance into the prieſthood under the old government, were now not only accepted, but ſought after. To theſe were added the ſecular prieſts and monks who had apoſtatized. Even the wretches who had been expulſed from their cures, or orders, for irregular or criminal conduct, were now called in from Germany and the Low Countries. What a ſight muſt it be, to thoſe who yet preſerved ſome reſpect for their religion and their country, to ſee theſe ſtrollers, with their ſtrumpets at their heels, returning to take on them the care of the morals and ſouls of a numerous people! After all, the number of apoſtates was inſufficient: a great many pariſhes remained without any prieſt at all.

The inſtalment of the new prieſts was commonly, not to ſay always, attended with tumult and violence. Many of their predeceſſors were knocked down, ſtabbed, or ſhot, at their church doors, the day, or day after, they had refuſed to conform. The prieſt of the village of Spet-Saux, while he was explaining to his pariſhioners his reaſons for refuſing to take the oath, received a muſket-ball in his breaſt, and tumbled dead from the pulpit into the aiſle.

Where there was no reſiſtance but on the part of the prieſt, an aſſaſſination put an end to the ſtruggle;

gle: but, in ſome places, the reſiſtance was more general. The pariſhioners were divided; one part the champions of the apoſtate, and the other thoſe of the old prieſt. Church-time was the moment for deciding theſe diſputes, and the churchyard the field of action. Theſe affrays were often bloody; victory ſometimes leaned to the ſide of juſtice; but, as the apoſtate appeared in perſon at the head of his troops, as he had the young people generally on his ſide, and always the mob and municipal officers, with their national guards, he ſeldom failed to keep the field. Some of theſe wretches have been ſeen conducted to the altar to the ſound of drums and trumpets, at the very moment when their partiſans were murdering on the outſide of the church.

The expelling of the parochial Clergy tried the real ſentiments of the body of the French people more than any one act of their tyrants ever did, before or ſince. Generally ſpeaking, the trial was honourable to them; for, if we except Paris, and ſome other places immediately under the influence of the revolutionary clubs, they wiſhed to retain their ancient paſtors, and did not ſcruple to declare that wiſh, notwithſtanding the vociferations of hundreds of mob in the pay of the Aſſembly; notwithſtanding all thoſe petty aſſemblies of ſubaltern tyrants, called municipal officers, who came to order them to receive an apoſtate *in the name of the law*; notwithſtanding thouſands of ſpies and aſſaſſins, ever ready to betray and murder them; in ſpite of all theſe, whole pariſhes flocked round their prieſts, preſſed them to continue, followed them to the fields, and left the apoſtates to ſay maſs to the bare walls. Many of the latter, though they continued to receive the revolutionary ſalary for upwards of two years, never could boaſt of above three or four voluntary hearers.

Wherever this obſtinate attachment to religion appeared,

appeared, the Aſſembly knew how to make the refractory feel their authority. True tyrants, they ſuffered no one to thwart their will with impunity. Property, honour, conſcience, all muſt yield to their ſultanic decrees!

Condorcet, the atheiſt Cordorcet, propoſed flagellation; and this was pretty commonly inflicted on the women and children who aſſiſted at the maſſes of the nonjuring Clergy. The Abbé Barruel (page 79 of the French edition) tells us, that three ſiſters of one of the charity-houſes at Paris expired under the rods of the aſſaſſins. Ungrateful monſters! The lives of theſe women had been totally devoted to the ſervice of the ſick, the lame, and the blind. By their vow they were excluded from the pleaſures of the world, without being excluded from its pains. They had made a voluntary ſurrender of all they poſſeſſed, had aſſumed the garb, and ſubmitted to the auſterities of the monaſtic life, in order to devote themſelves to the mournful occupation of attending on the poor who laboured under infirmities. It was ſaid, they did this to ſecure themſelves a place in heaven; and moſt certainly they took the ſureſt way. I feel a reluctance to call ſuch people ſuperſtitious; for, if they were ſo, their ſuperſtition was of a moſt amiable kind, and ſurely nothing ſhort of the principles of this helliſh revolution could have hardened the hearts of men to ſcourge them to death, and that merely becauſe they would not diſgrace themſelves by receiving the ſacrament from the contaminated hands of an apoſtate.

It were endleſs to enumerate all the different ſorts of perſecution exerciſed againſt thoſe who remained attached to their religion. Little children were beaten half to death; the hair and ears of women were cut off; they were mounted on aſſes, and led about in the moſt unſeemly and ſhocking guiſe. The inſtance of John Cantabel deſerves particular

ticular notice. Cantabel was an honeſt peaſant, ſincerely attached to the religion of his fathers. He happened to have a little catechiſm which had been publiſhed by the nonjuring Clergy; it was found in his houſe; and this was a ſufficient crime. A committee of municipal officers ordered the catechiſm to be burnt; a great fire was made; Cantabel was brought forth, and commanded to throw the book into it. "No," ſays the heroic peaſant, "it con-"tains the principles of my religion; it has been "my guide and my comfort, and it now gives me "the courage to tell you, that I will never commit "it to the flames." Upon this he was threatened, but ſtill he remained reſolute. One of the ruffians ſeized a flaming torch, and held it under his hand. "Burn on," ſaid he; "you may burn not only my "hand, but my whole body, before I will do any "thing to diſhonour my religion." He was afterwards mounted on a horſe, his back to the head, and the tail in his hand, and was thus conducted about amidſt the ſhouts of the rabble. The vile wretches, when tired with their ſport, ſuffered him to creep home more dead than alive. This is the *liberty of conſcience* in the "*Age of Reaſon!*" This is the *toleration* we might expect from atheiſts, from thoſe infidel philoſophers who are continually exclaiming againſt the prejudices of their forefathers, and againſt the ſad effects of bigotry and religious zeal. In the cant of theſe *enlightened* reformers, this peaſant was a *fanatic*, an *ariſtocrat*, a *rebel to the law*, and, as ſuch, they will tell you that he was worthy of death.

Notwithſtanding the partial oppoſition the apoſtates met with, and the horror their conduct, as well as their miniſtry, excited in all good minds, they, at laſt, found themſelves in poſſeſſion of the churches, to the excluſion of the ancient prieſts. Such of theſe latter as had eſcaped death were now

bereft of all means of ſubſiſtence; they were therefore obliged to become a charge to their faithful pariſhioners. Had there been any ſuch things as toleration and liberty under the Conſtituent Aſſembly, theſe unfortunate men might ſtill have found a retreat amongſt their wealthy neighbours, that would have left them no reaſon to regret the loſs of their ſalaries. But the greater part of their wealthy neighbours were already reduced to their own ſituation, and thoſe who were not, knew that the reception of a nonjuring prieſt would amount to a proof of *ariſtocracy*, ſufficient to lead them to the guillotine. The expulſed prieſts were then obliged to take ſhelter in ſome obſcure and miſerable cabin; and often was the torture ſo great, that, like perſons infected with the plague, no one would admit them beneath his roof.

From ſuch a ſtate of miſery and humiliation ſome fled in diſguiſe to the countries ſurrounding France; ſome to receſſes in the foreſt, whither the peaſants of the neighbourhood brought them the means of exiſtence. Numbers, however, ſtill remained in their towns and villages. Seeing the whole country ſwarming with aſſaſſins, they thought, perhaps, they might as well wait the ſtab in their own pariſhes as ſeek it at a diſtance. Many, too, from age and infirmity, were abſolutely incapable of travelling; and, beſides, the ſmall remainder of a life ſo full of bitterneſs, could not, with ſuch men, be an object of ſufficient importance to induce them to abandon thoſe of their pariſhioners who ſtill ſought their advice and conſolation. Some were retained by their affection to their relations or their parents; it is ſo hard to break the bands of nature, to tear one's ſelf from all one holds dear, that the riſk of death, in competition with ſuch a ſeparation, loſes half its terrors.

The ancient prieſts who remained in their pariſhes,

or

or near them, though often obliged to ſecrete themſelves, and though, to appearance, generally ſhunned, were reſorted to by great numbers, particularly of the elderly people. I have already obſerved, that among the youth there was a pretty general bias toward the apoſtates. Hence enſued ſuch ſcenes of diviſion and perſecution as no country on earth, except France, ever witneſſed. Friends were divided againſt friends; one branch of a family againſt another. It often happened that the parents treated their children as apoſtates, and the children their parents as ariſtocrats; quarrels and bloodſhed were as often the conſequences. We have ſeen (page 93 of this volume) a ſon cut off the heads of his father and mother, becauſe they refuſed to attend to the maſs of an apoſtate, carry the heads to his club, and receive applauſes for the deed. Acts like theſe were not frequent; but others, very near approaching it, were not only frequent but general. Sons, and even daughters, have been known to beat and lacerate their parents in the moſt cruel manner. Hundreds of both ſexes have been led to priſon, and publicly accuſed by their children. A man at Faulconberg, in Artois, blew his wife's brains out with his muſket, and left her wallowing in her blood on the hearth with ſeven ſmall children crying round her!

Can any man, with the common feelings of humanity about his heart, contemplate ſuch ſcenes of horror without execrating the revolution that gave riſe to them*?

The

* Many writers (and among others Thomas Paine) have remarked, that the French paid great reſpect, even a ſort of adoration, to old people: if this was the caſe, which I am by no means inclined to deny, or doubt, what ſort of a revolution muſt that be which has changed this reſpect and veneration, ſo juſtly due to old age, into ſcorn and contempt, into a mercileſs brutality, nay, into

The apoſtate prieſts failed not to fan the flames of diſcord and diviſion. To ingratiate themſelves with the young and ignorant, they mixed in all their amuſements and debauches, treated them at their own houſes, and inſtituted civic feſtivals for the mob, with whom they were continually ſurrounded. Their maſſes were ſung amidſt the ſhouts of robbers and murderers, and often interrupted by the arrival of ſome innocent conſcientious perſon, dragged in to aſſiſt at what he looked upon as a profanation. Their churches reſembled guard-houſes, rather than places of divine worſhip. In proportion as they perceived themſelves neglected and deſpiſed, their wrath againſt their unſhaken predeceſſors increaſed. Vexed and humiliated to find that all the reſpectable part of their pariſhioners took as much pains to avoid them as to ſeek a communication with their old paſtors, the whole weight of their vengeance fell on theſe latter. In their exiſtence itſelf they ſaw a memento of their own infamy. There is not a ſpecies of cruelty that the moſt obdurate can deviſe which they left uneſſayed. They hunted them from their retreats, from the houſes of their friends and relations, from the woods and caverns even, to expoſe them to inſult and murder. The infirmities of age, the tears of parents, nothing could ſoften the hearts of theſe apoſtate wretches. We have ſeen enough of the ſufferings of the old Clergy in the firſt chapter

---

into parricide. Solon made no law to puniſh ſacrilege or parricide; becauſe, he obſerved, "the firſt was as yet unknown in Athens, "and the ſecond was ſo directly againſt all the feelings of nature, "that he did not believe it could ever be committed."—Poor Solon did not live in the "enlightened eighteenth century," or he would never have talked in this way. If he could but riſe from the grave, and liſten to our philoſophers, they would not only convince him that ſuch actions are poſſible, but they would tell him they were indiſpenſably neceſſary to the eſtabliſhment of a free republican government. Had Solon been at Paris ſince the revolution, he would have been guillotined for a rank ariſtocrat.

of this work; but there is yet one inſtance which I muſt quote: "I was at Trois Rivières (ſays Le "Voyageur de la Revolution), a little village in "Picardy: I ſaw ſeveral women running by the "inn where I had put up; they all ſeemed much "alarmed. I aſked the landlord what was the "matter: he told me that the revolutionary prieſt, "provoked to find that none of the village attended "at his maſs, had been that morning to Ville d'Eu "for a party of national guards, to aid him in "driving the former prieſt from a little cottage "where he and his mother had taken ſhelter. "The man gave me a moſt affecting account of "this good prieſt, who was upwards of fourſcore "years of age, and who had been the rector of that "place for more than fifty years. On the day he "was to deliver his cure into the hands of the "apoſtate, he ſummoned his little flock to meet "him in the church for the laſt time. Not a ſoul "was abſent, old or young. The women carried "their infants in their arms; and two old people, "not able to walk, were carried on couches. *My "children*, ſays the old man, *I have preſſed your "tender hands on the baptiſmal font: I have ſung the "requiem for the ſouls of your fathers: I muſt now "bid you an eternal farewell, deprived of the conſola-"tion of leaving my aſhes amongſt you.*"—Here he "ceaſed; tears ſtifled his voice; the ſobs and cries "of his audience rendered the ſcene too much for "him. While the landlord was ſpeaking, we heard "a diſcharge of muſkets, and a loud ſhriek of wo-"men. We ran to the ſpot. The peaſants of the "village, about forty in number, had aſſembled "round the cottage with clubs to defend their "paſtor; but, the enemy having fire-arms, they "had been obliged to give way, leaving two of "their companions dead, and ſeveral wounded. I "now beheld a ſight ſufficient to melt the heart of "a tiger.

" a tiger. Two ruffians of the national guard " were dragging out this venerable old man by the " hair of his head, by thoſe locks as white as ſnow. " He had received a wound in his cheek, from " which the blood ran down on his garments.—In " this ſituation was he led off, bare headed and " bare-footed, towards *Ville d'Eu*, while his poor " old parent, who had been many years blind and " dumb, remained on her bed, happily inſenſible " of the ſorrows of her ſon. As the villains pulled " him along, all the words he was heard to utter, " were, ' My mother! Oh! my mother!'—The " women and children of the village followed the " eſcort with cries and lamentations, till the ſa- " vages drove them back with the points of their " bayonets."

Nor were thoſe of the laity ſpared, who reſorted to the old Clergy for the exerciſe of the rites which they looked upon as eſſential. A new-married couple having refuſed to have the ceremony performed by one of the apoſtates, a party of his myrmidons broke in among them on the wedding-night. The huſband made his eſcape: the wife, in a ſwoon, became the prey of the party. They gratified their brutal paſſion, without gratifying their ferocity. They tore off her breaſts, as a tiger might have done with his claws, and threw them on the floor. They then left her to wait till death relieved her from her horrible ſituation*.

* *See Hiſtory of the French Clergy, page* 138.—I cannot help remarking here, that it is ſomething wonderful this Hiſtory is not more known in America. It is a proof, among hundreds, how locked up we have been to every thing that might lead us to a juſt eſtimation of the French revolution. It is true, the greater part of the newſpapers have ſet their faces againſt truth; but ſurely, were the preſſes free, we ought not to ſuffer ourſelves to be kept in the dark by people, who are, probably, paid for ſo doing.

I ſhould have ſcrupled inſerting a fact like this, though taken from ſo reſpectable a work, if the former part of this volume did not contain others, if poſſible, ſurpaſſing it; I ſay, if poſſible; for I declare I know not which is moſt ſhocking, the tearing off a woman's breaſts, or the ripping a child from her womb, and ſticking it on the point of a bayonet. Indeed, the greater part of the facts related here, are ſo much more ſhocking and terrific than any thing we have ever before had an idea of, that common murders appear as trifling.

By means like theſe, the old Clergy and their adherents were extirpated, and religion along with them. The buſineſs of the new Clergy (if the wretches deſerve the name) was not to eſtabliſh one church on the ruins of another: it would be as prepoſterous as to ſuppoſe that an aſſembly of atheiſts and deiſts had any ſuch intention, as to ſuppoſe that a horde of apoſtates were calculated for the work. Theſe latter were, in fact, ſo many miſſionaries of blaſphemy and murder, ſent into the provinces purpoſely to deſtroy the ancient prieſthood. The Aſſembly foreſaw, that when that was done, their new prieſts would at any time become the apoſtles of infidelity.

It muſt be conſidered, that theſe legiſlators did not want for cunning: an elegant writer has lately called them "architects of ruin;" and, indeed, they poſſeſſed the art of deſtroying in its utmoſt perfection. Their calculations with reſpect to their new prieſts were extremely juſt; they came out to an unit. When they had annihilated their predeceſſors, they were not only ready to ſecond the decrees for the abolition of Chriſtianity altogether; they were not only inſtrumental therein, but they had led the way. Several began to teach the religion of *Reaſon* in the Jacobin clubs, of which they were all members, and even in the pulpit. The garb

garb of a prieſt itſelf became a burden to them, and they humbly aſked leave to quit it for the more honourable one of the national guard. The apoſtate Biſhop of Moulin, who had been conſecrated by the unhallowed hands of *Talleyrand*, wrote to the Convention, that he officiated with a pike and liberty cap, inſtead of the croſier and the mitre. It was this vile wretch who firſt cauſed to be written on the gate of the burying-ground, "*This is the place of* "*everlaſting ſleep.*"

Three weeks after this communication of the Biſhop of Moulin, *Gobet*, the new Biſhop of Paris, with his grand vicars and three other revolutionary biſhops, came to the hall of the legiſlators, and there abdicated Chriſtianity in form. They begged pardon of the injured nation for having ſo long kept them in the dark, by duping them into a belief of the divinity of an *impoſtor*, whoſe religion they now threw off with abhorrence, reſolved in future to acknowledge no other deity than *Reaſon* alone!

It was not more than four days after this, that a Pagan feſtival was held in the cathedral church of Paris. A woman named Momoro, the wife of another man, but the ſtrumpet of the vile Hebert, *alias* Father Du Chêne, was dreſſed up as the *Goddeſs of Reaſon.* Her throne was of green turf; an altar was erected at ſome diſtance, on which the prieſts burnt incenſe, while the legiſlators and the brutified Pariſian herd were proſtrated before the throne of the goddeſs *Reaſon, alias* Momoro, *alias* Du Chêne.

About this epoch appeared the Paganiſh republican Calendar, with a decree ordering its adoption. This was intended to root from the poor tyrannized people the very memory of religion; to dry up the only ſource of comfort they had left. They had been robbed of all they poſſeſſed in this world, and

their inexorable tyrants wiſhed to rob them of every hope in the next. Some ſay that this Calendar itſelf was compoſed by an apoſtate prieſt; others, that it was the work of the writer of farces, named Des Moulins. Whoever may be the author, we know who has the honour of reprinting it, and retailing it in this country.

It is true, the laſt-mentioned acts, the conſummation of the moſt horrid blaſphemy that ever man was witneſs of, took place under the Convention; but what were they more than a neceſſary conſequence of the meaſures of the Conſtituent Aſſembly? Nay, the leaders in that Aſſembly boaſted, when they had obtained the decree againſt the nonjuring prieſts, that they had tricked the people out of their religion, before they perceived it. Nor is there at this time one of thoſe who voted for that decree, who will not tell you, that Chriſtianity is a farce, fit only for the amuſement of old folks, and that he rejoices in its abolition in France. This is not mere ſurmiſe.

Indeed, that their ſucceſſors have only fulfilled their wiſhes, in this reſpect, there can be no doubt, if any judgment of the wiſhes of men is to be formed from their principles, their words, and their actions. Who, I aſk, that wiſhed to preſerve religion, would have paſſed a decree for the expulſion of every prieſt that refuſed to forſwear himſelf? Who, that did not wiſh to deſtroy religion, would have paſſed a decree for committing it to the care of apoſtates? Was it not clear that ſuch men would ſtick at nothing? that, at the nod of their maſters, they would at any time be ready to blaſpheme the God they pretended to adore? On the contrary, the Aſſembly knew that there was no hope of their ſyſtem taking root, while the ancient Clergy remained in their cures. Among men, who gave up their all, and expoſed themſelves to almoſt certain death,

death, rather than falſify their faith, they could not hope to find a *Gobet*. They could not hope to find ſupple villains that would voluntarily depoſe the emblems of their religion on the altar of a ſtrumpet, and confeſs themſelves to have been the crafty miniſters of an *arch impoſtor*.

The oath tendered to the Clergy was the touch-ſtone; it was to prove them; to know whom the Aſſembly could depend on for the accompliſhment of their projects, and whom they could not depend on. The enforcing of the oath was the laſt blow to public religion in France; and therefore the deſtruction of that religion, with all its immoral and murderous conſequences, is due to the Conſtituent Aſſembly, and to them alone. It is as nonſenſical as unjuſt to accuſe this or that faction, or even the Convention itſelf, of exchanging Chriſtianity for a ſyſtem of Paganiſm; infidels who adore an idol are as good as infidels who adore none; and where is the difference, whether the adored idol be Jean Jacques Rouſſeau, or Madame Momoro? An adultreſs is as good a goddeſs as an adulterer a god, at any time.

Let the reader now look back, and he will eaſily trace all the horrors of the French revolution to the decrees of the Conſtituent Aſſembly. It was they that rent the Government to pieces; it was they that firſt broached the deſtructive doctrine of equality; it was they that deſtroyed all ideas of private property; and finally, it was they that rendered the people hardened, by effacing from their minds every principle of the only religion capable of keeping mankind within the bounds of juſtice and humanity. Look alſo at their particular actions, and you will ſee them breaking their oaths to their conſtituents and to their King; you will ſee their agents driving people from their eſtates, beating and killing them; you will ſee them ſurrounded

with a ſet of hireling writers and aſſaſſins, employed to degrade and murder peaceful people attached to the religion of their forefathers; and you will ſee them not only pardoning murderers, in ſpite of their poor humiliated Monarch, but even receiving the aſſaſſins at their bar, covering them with applauſes, and inſtituting feſtivals in their honour. What have the members of the Convention and their agents done more than this? They have murdered in greater numbers. True; but what have numbers to do with the matter? The principle on which thoſe murders were committed was ever the ſame: it was more or leſs active as occaſion required. The wants of the Convention were more preſſing than thoſe of the Conſtituent Aſſembly. The Aſſembly were not driven to the expedient of *requiſitions*, nor was the hour yet arrived for the promulgation of the Paganiſh Calendar. Conſequently they met with leſs oppoſition, and therefore fewer murders were neceſſary; but, had they continued their ſittings to this day, the devaſtation of every kind would have been the ſame that it has been.

The whole hiſtory of the revolution preſents us with nothing but a regular progreſs in robbery and murder. The firſt Aſſembly, for inſtance, begin by flattering the mob, wheedling their King out of his title and his power; they then ſet him at defiance, proſcribe or put to death his friends; and then ſhut him up in his palace, as a wild beaſt in a cage. The ſecond Aſſembly ſend a gang of ruffians to inſult and revile him, and then they hurl him from his throne. The third Aſſembly cut his throat. What is there in all this but a regular and natural progreſſion from bad to worſe? And ſo with the reſt of their abominable actions.

To throw the blame on the ſucceſſors of the firſt deſpotic Aſſembly is ſuch a perverſion of reaſon, ſuch

ſuch an abandonment of truth, that no man, who has a ſingle grain of ſenſe, can hear of with patience. As well might we aſcribe all the murders committed at Nantz to the under-cut-throats, by whom they were perpetrated, and not to the Convention, by whoſe order, and under whoſe protection, theſe cut-throats acted. The Conſtituent Aſſembly knew the conſequences of their decrees, as well as Foucault (*ſee page* 116) knew the conſequence of his order for throwing forty women from the cliff Pierre Moine into the ſea; and it is full as ridiculous to hear them pretend that they did not with thoſe conſequences to follow, as it would be to hear Foucault pretend that he did not wiſh the forty women ſhould be drowned. True, the Convention are guilty of every crime under heaven; aſſaſſins and blaſphemers muſt ever merit deteſtation and abhorrence, from whatever motive they may act, or by whomſoever taught and inſtigated; but ſtill the pre-eminence in infamy is due to their teachers and inſtigators: the Convention is, in relation to the Conſtituent Aſſembly, what the ignorant deſperate bravo is in relation to his crafty and ſculking employer.

Before I conclude, it may not be improper, as I have hitherto ſpoken of the Conſtituent Aſſembly in a general way, to make ſome diſtinctions with reſpect to the perſons who compoſed it. I am very far from holding them all up as objects of abhorrence, or even of cenſure. There were many, very many, men of great wiſdom and virtue, who were elected to the States-General, and even who joined the Aſſembly, after it aſſumed the epithet *National*. It would be the height of injuſtice to reproach theſe men with the conſequences of meaſures, which they oppoſed with ſuch uncommon eloquence and courage. Hiſtory will make honourable mention of their names, when the epitome I have here attempted will

will be loſt and forgotten. Suffice it then to ſay, that the weight of our cenſure, of the cenſure of all juſt and good men, ought to fall on thoſe licentious politicians and infidel philoſophers alone, who ſanctioned the decree for the annihilation of property and religion.

Here, too, we ought to diveſt ourſelves of every thing of a perſonal or party nature, and direct our abhorrence to principles alone. As to the actors, they have, in general, already expiated their wickedneſs or folly by the loſs of their lives. We have ſeen the atheiſt Condorcet obliged to fly in diſguiſe from the capital, the inhabitants of which he had corrupted, and by whom he had been adored as the great luminary of the age: we have ſeen him aſſume the garb and the ſupplicating tone of a common beggar, lurking in the lanes and woods, like a houſeleſs thief, and, at laſt, literally dying in a ditch, leaving his carcaſs a prey to the fowls of the air, and his memory as a leſſon to future apoſtles of anarchy and blaſphemy. Scores, not to ſay hundreds, of his coadjutors have ſhared a fate little different from his own; and thoſe who have not, can have little reaſon to congratulate themſelves on their eſcape. The tornado they have raiſed for the deſtruction of others, has ſwept them from the ſeat of their tyranny, and ſcattered them over every corner of the earth. Thoſe haughty uſurpers, who refuſed the precedence to the ſucceſſors of Charlemagne, are now obliged to yield it to a peaſant or a porter. Thoſe who decreed that the "folding-doors of the Louvre ſhould fly open at their approach," are now glad to lift the latch of a wicket, and bend their heads beneath the thatch of a cabin. And what language can expreſs the vexation, the anguiſh, the cutting reflections, that muſt be the companions of their obſcurity! When they look back on their diſtracted country, when they behold the

the widows, the orphans, the thouſands and hundreds of thouſands of murdered victims, that it preſents; when they behold the frantic people, carrying the dagger to the hearts of their parents, nay, digging their forefathers from their graves, and throwing their aſhes to the winds; when they behold all this, and reflect that it is the work of their own hands, well might they call on the hills to hide them. The torments of ſuch an exiſtence, who can bear? Next to the wrath of Heaven, the malediction of one's country is ſurely the moſt tremendous and inſupportable.

Now, what is the advantage we ought to derive from the awful example before us? It ought to produce in us a watchfulneſs, and a ſteady reſolution to oppoſe the advances of diſorganizing and infidel principles. I am aware that it will be ſaid by ſome, that all fear of the progreſs of theſe principles is imaginary; but conſtant obſervation aſſures me that it is but too well founded. Let any man examine the change in political and religious opinions ſince the eſtabliſhment of the general government, and particularly the change crept in along with our filly admiration of the French revolution, and ſee if the reſult of his inquiries does not juſtify a fear of our falling under the ſcourge that has brought a happy and gallant people on their knees, and left them bleeding at every pore.

Unfortunately for America, Great Britain has thrown from her the principles of the French revolutioniſts with indignation and abhorrence. This, which one would imagine ſhould have had little or no influence on us, has ſerved, in ſome meaſure, as a guide to our opinions, and has been one of the principal motives for our actions. A combination of circumſtances, ſuch as, perhaps, never before met together, has ſo ſoured the minds of the great maſs of the people in this country, has worked up

their hatred againſt Great Britain to ſuch a pitch, that the inſtant that nation is named, they loſe not only their temper, but their reaſon alſo. The dictates of nature and the exerciſe of judgment are thrown aſide: whatever the Britiſh adopt muſt be rejected, and whatever they reject muſt be adopted. Hence it is, that all the execrable acts of the French legiſlators, not forgetting their murders and their blaſphemy, have met with the moſt unqualified applauſes, merely becauſe they were execrated in the iſland of Britain.

The word *Republic* has alſo done a great deal. France is a *republic*, and the decrees of the Legiſlators were neceſſary to maintain it a republic. This *word* outweighs, in the eſtimation of ſome perſons (I wiſh I could ſay they were few in number), all the horrors that have been, and that can be committed in that country. One of theſe modern republicans will tell you that he does not deny that hundreds of thouſands of innocent perſons have been murdered in France; that the people have neither religion nor morals; that all the ties of nature are rent aſunder; that the riſing generation will be a race of cut-throats; that poverty and famine ſtalk forth at large; that the nation is half depopulated; that its riches, along with millions of the beſt of the people, are gone to enrich and aggrandize its enemies; that its commerce, its manufactures, its ſciences, its arts, and its honour, are no more; but at the end of all this, he will tell you that it muſt be happy, becauſe it is a *republic*. I have heard more than one of theſe republican zealots declare, that he would ſooner ſee the laſt of the French exterminated, than ſee them adopt any other form of government. Such a ſentiment is characteriſtic of a mind locked up in ſavage ignorance; and I would no more truſt my throat within the reach of ſuch a republican, than I would within that

that of a Louvet, a Gregoire, or any of their colleagues.

Our enlightened philoſophers run on in a fine canting ſtrain about the bigotry and ignorance of their anceſtors; but I would aſk them, what more ſtupid doltiſh bigotry can there be, than to make the ſound of a word the ſtandard of good or bad government? What is there in the combination of the letters which make up the word *Republic?* what is there in the ſound they produce, that the bellowing of it forth ſhould compenſate for the want of every virtue, and even for common ſenſe and common honeſty? It is ſynonymous with liberty.—Fatal error! In the mouth of a turbulent demagogue it is ſynonymous with liberty, and with every thing elſe, that will pleaſe its hearers, but, with the man of virtue and ſenſe, has no more than its literal value; that is, it means of itſelf neither good nor evil. If he calls our own Government that of a *republic*, and judge of the meaning of the word by the effects of that Government, it will admit of a moſt amiable interpretation; but if we are to judge of it by what it has produced in France, it means all that is ruinous, tyrannical, blaſphemous, and bloody. Laſt winter, one of theſe republican heroes in Congreſs, accuſed a gentleman from New-England of having adopted *anti-republican* principles, becauſe he propoſed ſomething that ſeemed to militate *againſt negro-ſlavery!*—Thus, then, republicaniſm did not mean liberty. In ſhort, it means any thing: it is the watch-word of faction; and if ever our happy and excellently conſtituted republic ſhould be overturned, it will be done under the maſk of republicaniſm.

Let us, then, be upon our guard; let us look to the characters and actions of men, and not to their profeſſions; let us attach ourſelves to things, and not to words; to ſenſe, and not to ſound. Should the day of *requiſition* and *murder* arrive, our tyrants calling

calling themſelves republicans, will be but a poor conſolation to us. The loſs of property, the preſſure of want and beggary, will not be leſs real becauſe flowing from republican decrees. Hunger pinches the republican, the cold blaſt cramps his joints as well as thoſe of other men. This word does not ſoften the pangs of death. The keen knife will not produce a delectable ſenſation, becauſe drawn acroſs the throat by a republican; nor will the word *republican* parry a bullet, or render a flaming fire a bed of down. When Monſieur Berthier had the ghaſtly head of his father preſſed againſt his lips, when his own heart was afterwards torn from his living body, and placed, all reeking and palpitating, on a table before a committee of magiſtrates, the agonies of his mind, and of his mangled carcaſs, were not aſſuaged by the ſhouts of his republican murderers.

Shall we ſay that theſe things never can take place among us? Becauſe we have hitherto preſerved the character of a pacific humane people, ſhall we ſet danger at defiance? Though we are not Frenchmen, we are men as well as they; and conſequently are liable to be miſled, and even to be ſunk to the loweſt degree of brutality, as they have been. They, too, had an amiable character: what character have they now? The ſame principles brought into action among us would produce the ſame degradation. I repeat, we are not what we were before the French revolution. Political projectors from every corner of Europe, troublers of ſociety of every deſcription, from the whining philoſophical hypocrite to the daring rebel, and more daring blaſphemer, have taken ſhelter in theſe States. Will it be pretended that the principles and paſſions of theſe men have changed with the change of air? It would be folly to ſuppoſe it.

Nor

Nor are men of the ſame ſtamp wanting among the native Americans. There is not a ſingle action of the French revolutioniſts, but has been juſtified and applauded in our public papers, and many of them in our public aſſemblies. Anarchy has its open advocates. The divine Author of our religion has been put upon a level with the infamous Marat. We have ſeen a clergyman of the epiſcopal church publicly abuſed, becauſe he had recommended to his congregation to beware of the atheiſtical principles of the French. Even their Calendar, the frivolous offspring of infidelity, is propoſed for our imitation. Where perſons whoſe livelihood depends on their daily publication are to be found, who are ever ready to publiſh articles of this nature, it were the groſſeſt folly not to believe that there are hundreds and thouſands to whom they give pleaſure *. But we are not left to mere ſurmiſe here. How many numerous companies have iſſued, under the form of toaſts, ſentiments offenſive to humanity, and diſgraceful to our national character? We have ſeen the *guillotine* toaſted to three times three cheers, and even under the diſcharge of cannon. If drunken men, as is uſually the caſe, ſpeak from the bottom of their hearts, what quarter ſhould we have to expect from wretches like theſe? It muſt be allowed, too, that where the cannons were fired to give eclat to ſuch a ſentiment, the convives were not of the moſt deſpicable claſs. And what would the reader ſay, were I to tell him of a Member of Congreſs, who

* It is a truth that no one will deny, that the newſpapers of this country have become its ſcourge. I ſpeak with a few exceptions. It is ſaid that they enlighten the people; but their light is like the torch of an incendiary, and the one has the ſame deſtructive effect on the mind as the other has on matter. The whole ſtudy of the editors ſeems to be to deceive and confound. One would almoſt think they were hired by ſome malicious demon, to turn the brains and corrupt the hearts of their readers.

wiſhed

wiſhed to ſee one of theſe murderous machines employed for lopping off the heads of the French, permanent in the State-houſe yard of the city of Philadelphia?

If theſe men of blood had ſucceeded in plunging us into a war; if they had once got the ſword into their hands, they would have mowed us down like ſtubble. The word *Ariſtocrat* would have been employed to as good account here, as ever it had been in France. We might, ere this, have ſeen our places of worſhip turned into ſtables; we might have ſeen the banks of the Delaware, like thoſe of the Loire, covered with human carcaſſes, and its waters tinged with blood: ere this we might have ſeen our parents butchered, and even the head of our admired and beloved Preſident rolling on a ſcaffold.

I know the reader will ſtart back with horror. His heart will tell him that it is impoſſible. But, once more, let him look at the example before us. The man who in 1788 ſhould have predicted the fate of the laſt humane and truly patriotic Louis, would have been treated as a wretch or a madman. The attacks on the character and conduct of the aged *Waſhington*, have been as bold, if not bolder, than thoſe which led to the downfal of the unfortunate French Monarch. His impudent and ferocious enemies have repreſented him as cankered with every vice that marks a worthleſs tyrant: they have called him the betrayer of the liberties of his country, and have even drawn up and publiſhed *articles of accuſation* againſt him! Can it then be imagined, that, had they poſſeſſed the power, they wanted the will to dip their hands in his blood? I am fully aſſured that theſe wretches do not make a hundred thouſandth part of the people of the Union: the name of *Waſhington* is as dear and dearer to all the moderate Whigs, than it ever was. But of what conſequence is their affection to him, of what avail to

themſelves, if they ſuffer him to be thus treated, without making one ſingle effort to defeat the project of his infamous traducers? It is not for me to dictate the method of doing this: but ſure I am, that had the friends of virtue and order ſhown only a hundredth part of the zeal in the cauſe of their own country, as the enemies of both have done in the cauſe of France, we ſhould not now have to lament the exiſtence of a hardened and impious faction, whoſe deſtructive principles, if not timely and firmly oppoſed, may one day render the annals of America as diſgraceful as thoſe of the French revolution.

ADDITIONAL FACTS.

Extracts from "The Banditti Unmaſked; or, Hiſtorical Memoirs of the preſent Times:" by General Danican.

Pages 25, 26.

THE Military Commiſſion ſent the municipal officers of Laval, without apprizing me of their intention, to the Pont de Cé, whither they conducted, at the ſame time, *fifty cartloads* of nuns, prieſts, ſuſpected perſons, federaliſts, and *men of property*, who were all guillotined, drowned, or ſhot. The forty municipal officers were included in this infernal expedition, by the order of one MILLIERE, who had been a member of the Pariſian commune during the maſſacres of September, and who was now a member of the Military Commiſſion. This act of barbarity developed all the germs of inſurrection, and the children ſwore to avenge the death of their fathers. This ſame MILLIERE, who reſides at

Paris, in the ſection of the Bonnet-Rouge *(Red-Cap)*, abſolutely inſiſted on having a hundred and thirty-two inhabitants of Nantz, whom *Carrier* had ſent to *Francaſtel*, ſhot at Angers; he came to me ſeveral times on this buſineſs, deſired I would cauſe them to be ſearched, and even urged me to ſearch them myſelf, "Becauſe," ſaid he, "they are too rich, and may corrupt the garriſon." He made twenty applications to me for troops to ſhoot them, obſerving, that during a ſiege, ſuch operations were mere matters of courſe, &c. &c. I deviſed a thouſand pretexts for refuſing to comply with his commands, and God knows what ſtratagems I was obliged to employ, in order to avert the fatal blow.

During the ſiege of Angers, Milliere and his accomplices cauſed *three or four thouſand* Frenchmen to be put to death at the Pont de Cé, and among the number was my landlord. The witneſſes to theſe horrors were Hortode, Clerk to the Committee of War; Chriſtophe, a Captain in the 8th regiment of huſſars; and La Croix, Adjutant-general, now attached to the Pariſian ſtaff, who was the man that conveyed to Laval the municipal officers that were drowned by the order of Milliere.

Page 27.—It is a certain fact, that a ſoldier of Marat's Company, who was employed on theſe expeditions, propoſed to ſave a young girl on *certain conditions*; but the virtuous victim turned from him with diſdain, and preſſing cloſe to her mother, accompanied her in the fatal boat.

Francaſtel cauſed full as many to be drowned at Angers as *Carrier* did at Nantz; and this little monſter is ſtill ſuffered to exiſt, and calls himſelf a patriot of 89! One *Vial*, Procureur Syndic in the department of Angers, told *Francaſtel* in my preſence, *that he had juſt found two confidental ſeamen, who would drown the prieſts that were at Montjean.*

Page 37.—General *Parrien* was an uſeful actor on the

the revolutionary ſtage. He was poſted at Marſeilles to maſſacre the priſoners from Orleans. On the ſecond of September he preſided at one of the tribunals in the priſons of Paris; he was afterwards preſident of the Military Commiſſion at Saumur, and was called to that at Lyons by his friend *Collot d'Herbois,* who, delighted with his ſervices, transformed the Judge into a *General of Diviſion.* On the pretended return of the reign of juſtice, he was diſmiſſed and impriſoned at Pleſſis. He roſe again on the holy day of vengeance (in October, 1795, when he acted as General for the Convention, when they ordered the troops to fire on the people for daring to aſſert the right of chooſing their own repreſentatives), and has recently availed himſelf of the amneſty, together with a great number of perſonages of equal worth and integrity. This patriot of 89 has put to death upwards of *ſix thouſand* Frenchmen, and was the aſſociate of *Milliere* in La Vendée.

Page 70.—Depopulation was at that time (in 1794) the order of the day, and *Carnot* diſplayed his judgment in the choice of General *Vachot.* The only qualification requiſite to form a good *ſans-culotte* General, was to know how to maſſacre. Thus the *brave* and celebrated *Roſſignol,* ſucceſſor to General *Biron,* after having promiſed, at the bar of the Convention, to purge La Vendée in a fortnight, completely ſucceeded in exterminating, in leſs than three months, *one hundred thouſand men* of both parties.

Page 84.—While *Carrier* drowned 20,000 victims; while *Prieur* cauſed the federaliſts of Breſt to be guillotined (and, among others, the father of General *Moreau,* on the very day on which the ſon took the fort of Sluys); while *Barras* and *Freron* demoliſhed Toulon, and ſhot 800 of our ſailors and naval officers; a madman named *La Planche,* formerly a Benedictine monk, repreſented at Caen,

Tiberius in a ſtate of delirium: on his arrival in that city, he perceived a conſternation on every countenance, occaſioned by the guillotine, and particularly by the preſence of a Deputy. "What means," ſaid he, "this ariſtocratic terror that I obſerve? I *order* "*a civic promenade*, and, this evening, I ſhall give "a republican ball; I ſhall conſider all thoſe who "ſhall fail to attend as ariſtocrats." The promenade began at ten in the morning; *La Planche* took the lead, followed by the whole population of Caen; and, from time to time, halted, and kneeling on the ground, addreſſed an invocation to *Marat*, to whom he made a preparatory offering of the heads of ſeveral perſons whom he cauſed to be tried and condemned. In the very middle of the town *La Planche* exclaimed, with uplifted hands, *O great Marat!* The people who followed in his train eagerly re-echoed *O great Marat!* At the civic ball in the evening, he played with women's necks, obſerving, that their boſoms were ariſtocrats that ſunk beneath the hand of a republican; and he compelled many of theſe unhappy beings to dance with him, while their huſbands and their fathers were lingering in priſon.

In October, 1793, in obedience to the decrees of the National Convention, the whole country of La Vendée was ſet fire to, and even the patriotic diſtricts were not ſpared. Each column was preceded by fire and ſword, by the aid of which an univerſal deſtruction was effected, without diſtinction of age or ſex. An immenſe population fled before the republicans, in order to eſcape the fury of the flames, and joined the Catholic army, which was forced to paſs the Loire at St. Florent. Let thoſe who are endued with ſenſibility repreſent to their imaginations more than a hundred thouſand French, men, women, and children, caſting their eyes, in deſpair, on a tract of country twenty leagues in circumference, where their houſes and cottages were in a ſtate of

of conflagration, and having but a few moments to eſcape from certain death.

Pages 171, 172.—*Lepelletier Brutus, Beaurepaire Magnier* (the pompous name aſſumed by the Preſident of a Revolutionary Tribunal at Rennes), breakfaſting, on Good-Friday, with his colleagues, ſaid to them, "Brothers and friends, we muſt put "to death this day, at the ſame hour at which the "*counter-revolutioniſt* JESUS died, that young de-"votee who was lately arreſted." An order was immediately ſigned for bringing her before him. The gaoler made a miſtake, and ſent him a girl of the town, whom the Judges proceeded to queſtion on her fanaticiſm, on the relics, the agnuſes, and the chaplets that were found upon her when ſhe was arreſted; and on her predilection for refractory prieſts. The girl did not underſtand what they meant, and began to laugh; upon which the clerk was told to write down, "*That ſhe did not deign to* "*anſwer, and that ſhe treated the Tribunal with con-*"*tempt.*" They were about to pronounce ſentence of death upon her, when the girl exclaimed with all her might, that ſhe was no devotee, and that ſhe had been put in priſon for debauching and infecting a battalion of volunteers. *Brutus* knitted his brows, and thought it was a ſubterfuge. The girl, in alarm, had recourſe to an indecent geſture, and was going to ſhow *the truth*, as ſhe called it, when the Judges, perceiving their miſtake, ſent her back to priſon, and ordered the true devotee to be brought before them, whom they arraigned to the ſcaffold, agreeably to a determination which they had formed while they were eating their breakfaſt. *This fact is known to the whole town of Rennes.* The battalion of young children, in the ſame place, was employed to ſhoot the Chouans; *Dubois Crancé* ſtarted the idea, in order, as he ſaid, to accuſtom youths to *republican firmneſs*. No man dares deny this.—I was at

Kennes at the time, and the Deputy *Alquier* no doubt recollects my obſervation upon the ſubject. I take a pleaſure in declaring that I found him to poſſeſs ſome ſenſibility. He repeatedly ſaid to me, with tears in his eyes, in his own apartment, "*You ſay too* "*much, my dear Danican*; you will bring yourſelf "to the *guillotine*." The Deputy *Alquier* was terribly afraid on his own account.

Page 177.—It was under the command of that miſcreant (General *Turreau de la Liniere)*, that the ſoldiers carried children on the points of their bayonets: I ſaw the original orders by which M. *Turreau* preſcribed *univerſal maſſacre*, and yet M. *Turreau* has juſt been acquitted, and is now employed by the Directory, who call ſuch men as M. *Turreau de la Liniere*, energetic republicans.

Page 193.—That I may not be accuſed of always ſpeaking *ab irato*, I ſhall quote *Vial*'s book on La Vendée. This man, as I before obſerved, was a revolutioniſt and a drowner, but having quarrelled with his colleagues, he denounced them.

Page 130.—"On the 23d Ventoſe, *Turreau* ar- "rived at *Châlonnes*; the next day he burnt the poſ- "ſeſſions of the patriots, and cauſed ſeveral women "and children to be ſhot; I eſcaped with the de- "ſtruction of a farm."—Again,

Page 78.—"Of *twenty thouſand* perſons who "were *ſhot* in the department of Maine and Loire, "it is proved by five ſentences, now before me, "that five hundred and ninety were not dead in "law *(hors la loi)*; ſeventy-nine were executed on "the 3d Nivoſe; ſeventy-five on the 4th; two "hundred and thirty-three on the 6th; one hun- "dred and five on the 23d; and ninety-nine on the "26th Germinal." A *very great number of children* were included in theſe five ſentences.

Francaſtel, in his letter on the eſtabliſhment of the Military Commiſſion, ſays, "That ſo long as "there

" there exiſt great criminals or federaliſts in theſe " countries, the ordinary tribunals ought not to " act."—Vial, addreſſing himſelf to the popular club at Angers, obſerves, " You all know, citizens, " that more than two thouſand women and children " have been aſſaſſinated in this infamous manner." Vacheron and Morin, members of that deteſtable commiſſion, drew up the liſts. Two women obſerved to Obrumier, " That they had only been ar- " reſted as ſuſpected perſons; but, notwithſtanding " this, he ordered them to be ſhot, with ſeventy " other females. When any of theſe unhappy be- " ings were obſerved to breathe, after they had been " ſhot, the humane Goupil plunged his ſabre into " their bellies." The citizens of Angers depoſed, " That they ſaw all theſe victims paſs by their " doors, accompanied by muſic playing patriotic " tunes; that they obſerved girls of fifteen and ſix- " teen, doubly intereſting by their beauty and their " youth, embracing the knees of their execution- " ers, and entreating them to ſpare their lives; and " that every body (even the troops) ſhed tears, ex- " cept the monſters of the Military Commiſſion, " who had the barbarity to inſult the ſenſibility of " the people."

Page 127.—The members of this commiſſion were Antoine Felix, Preſident, and ſucceſſor to Parrein; François Milliere; François Le Port; Jacques Hudoux; Joſeph Rouffel; Marie Obrumier; Gabriel Goupil; and Loiſillon. All theſe men are alive and well. Long live Juſtice and the Directory! *Bon jour* CARNOT!

Pages 209, 210.—Yes, conquering people! *twenty towns, and eighteen hundred villages, or hamlets, have been burned by you!* And your glory and your laurels have coſt you *three millions of men.* Theſe afflicting truths cannot be repeated too often, there are ſo many perſons who do not believe them.

For inſtance, what people in Europe do not take for a fable, the eſtabliſhment of a tanyard at Meudon, for *tanning human ſkins?* It cannot, however, be forgotten, that a man came to the bar of the Convention to announce the diſcovery of a new and ſimple mean for procuring leather in abundance; that the Committee of Public Safety (Carnot's* Committee) aſſigned him a convenient place for the execution of his plan, at the Caſtle of Meudon, the gates of which were kept conſtantly ſhut; and laſtly, that *Barrere*, *Vadier*, and others, were the firſt who wore *boots made of human ſkin*. *Robeſpierre* did not flay his people *figuratively*; and as Paris ſupplied the army with ſhoes, it is poſſible that more than one defender of the country may have worn ſhoes made of the ſkin of his friends and relations. This will appear pleaſant and incredible to certain *miſcreants*, and particularly to the Propagandiſts.

National Convention, a tanyard was eſtabliſhed at Meudon, for tanning human ſkins, and France was indebted to your exiſtence for a conception ſo monſtrous!

Page 212.—The troops who went from Holland to Britanny committed every ſpecies of crime on their march; and, in the neighbourhood of Rouen, they literally *broiled* the feet of a peaſant, in order to extort a diſcovery of his money. I ſent forty regular depoſitions on this ſubject to the Staff, and to the terroriſt *Pille*. Theſe were the ſame troops who attempted to kill the coxcombs (muſcadins) at Rouen, and who drew their ſabres on men for wearing their hair in a club. The vigorous means which I adopted prevented them from putting their threats in execution; but they made themſelves am-

* Carnot is one of the preſent Directors in France!!! 1797.

ple

ple amends for the diſappointment, at the theatre at Caen, under the auſpices of General *Dubayet.*

Pages 230, 231, 232.—*The moſt ſignal banditti of the Convention were the very heroes whom the Convention extolled. Maignet* reduced Bedouin to aſhes, and cauſed the inhabitants to be maſſacred. *Carpentier*, a bailiff of Valognes, committed a million of crimes at St. Malo; he ſtripped all the veſſels, plundered the houſes of private perſons, ſent the moſt opulent merchants, and the moſt virtuous fathers of families, to *Fouquier Tinville*, and openly preached pillage to the popular clubs. *Turreau*, during fifteen months the accomplice of *Bourbotte* and the *burner* of La Vendée, which he termed the *grand illumination*, wantonly conſumed by fire one of the ſuburbs of Saumur, when the enemy were twenty leagues from the place; and at Laval *gave me an order to put the ſick to death in their beds.* The order was ſolicited by one Baleguier, who delivered to me a copy of the deliberations, which is now in my poſſeſſion. This Turreau alſo made his couſin, Turreau de Grambouville et de Liniere, a General and *Burner* in Chief. Barras and Freron, the grand deſolaters of the South, where they were on miſſion with the worthy patriots Ricard, Salicetti, Robeſpierre junior, and Gaſton, wanted to level Marſeilles with the ground, and beſtowed on it the appellation of the *Nameleſs*. At Toulon they put in requiſition 1200 demoliſhers, and cauſed *upwards of two thouſand perſons* to be ſhot and guillotined. That impoſtor Jambon St. André, on his return to Breſt after the naval action of the firſt of June, 1794, ſuffered the people to ſtrew flowers upon his head, and made a report replete with falſehoods. Ricard, Choudieu, Garnier de Xaintes, and Levaſſeur de la Sarthe, were the accuſers and aſſaſſins of Philippeaux; the two firſt had the inſolence to pronounce a panegyric on the ferocious and cowardly Roſſignol.

Prieur

Prieur de la Marne, a madman, perpetually drunk, excited an inſurrection in Morbihan, in concert with a General Canuel, who rode over the bodies of the Chouans that were ſhot at Vannes; while at Joſſelin, one Battéux, a cook and commiſſary, delegated by Carrier and Prieur, made their victims dig the graves which they were deſtined to fill. The whole commune of Breſt went to denounce Prieur at the bar of the Convention. During the ſiege of Angers he put to death a prodigious number of women and girls, who were arreſted in the ſuburbs: after he had examined them and treated them with every mark of ridicule and contempt, he ordered them to be ſent to *the Hoſpital*, as he called it, and they were ſhot at the water-ſide. The ſoldiers laughed while they executed theſe orders, and ſtripped the bodies.

A Madame de Civrac, an abbeſs, was taken before Francaſtel and Prieur; ſhe had a faithful ſervant with her, who refuſed to quit her; they were accordingly both guillotined at Angers. This lady was at leaſt eighty years of age. Francaſtel cauſed ſeveral perſons to be drowned, even after the death of Robeſpierre. At Savenay, Prieur cauſed *twelve hundred peaſants*, who had laid down their arms, to be ſhot; after he had put them all together in a church, he ordered a republican column to halt, and the Chief of Brigade Carbon was entruſted with the direction of the maſſacre. This Carbon muſt ſtill be at Loudéac, where he informed me of the circumſtance at a time when he was under my command. At Noirmoutier, *fifteen hundred priſoners of war were ſhot.* It was there that the brave and virtuous D'Elbée periſhed, with ſeveral other officers of merit. At Mans, all the women that could be found were put to death. At Laval, nine months after all theſe maſſacres, I had the good fortune to ſave the life of a young girl of Maulevrier; who, at

the

the maſſacre at Mans, had received the laſt ſighs of her mother, on the high road, after which ſhe had lived ſix months in the woods.

Page 241.—In the action on the 5th of Auguſt, 1793, at Doué the vanguard took ſeventy-nine priſoners, who were conveyed to the tower at Saumur, whither I had occaſion to go a few days after, to ſee ſome huſſars of my own regiment, who were in priſon there. Having expreſſed a wiſh to ſee the Vendéan priſoners, I was taken to the bottom of a large tower, where, among a heap of dying perſons, *I ſaw one man actually dead*, and another expiring at his ſide. I fell down myſelf, nearly ſuffocated by the mephitical vapours, and they were obliged to carry me from the place. I ſent for the man who ſeemed to be dying, and gave him ſome broth, which revived him, and he afterwards recovered.

Soon after I left Saumur, *Levaſſeur* de la Sarthe arrived there. His firſt operation was to order the priſoners to be tied together in pairs, for the purpoſe, as he ſaid, of transferring them to another place; but he gave ſecret orders to have them put to death, and his orders were obeyed. From Saumur to Orleans, bands of fifty, ſixty, and even a hundred, were drowned or ſhot at one time; and the conductors, *Mogue* and *Petit*, put the allowance of theſe unhappy men in their own pockets. *Levaſſeur* openly boaſted of this expedition in the cave at the Thuilleries. (See the ſitting of the 1ſt Nivoſe, in the 2d year.)

Interrogate the civil authorities at Blois, and the keeper of the priſon at Saumur, on theſe facts.—On that day, 1ſt Nivoſe, *Lequinio* wrote to the Convention, to inform them that he had blown out the brains of two priſoners at Fontenai le Peuple, and that he had juſt cauſed five hundred to be ſhot. —(See the Moniteur.) This *Lequinio* has written a hiſtory of La Vendée, in which he denounces as aſ-

ſaſſins

faſſins all thoſe generals whom the Directory have ſince employed again. I declare that the Vendéans took upwards of thirty thouſand priſoners, whom they releaſed after ſhaving their heads; and that they committed no acts of cruelty until the republicans had ſet the example, by maſſacreing their rich, throwing them into the flames, &c.

On the 15th of July, 1793, at the battle of *Martigné*, the cowardly and ferocious ſtroller *Grammont* cut to pieces three priſoners who were tied together in the Caſtle of Felines. The Generals of the weſtern army were, as I have before obſerved, renegadoes, monks, conſtitutional prieſts, mountebanks, opera dancers, and blackguards *of every deſcription.*

The ſucceeding Extracts are ſelected from a Work recently publiſhed, entitled, " *A Reſidence in France,* " *during the Years* 1792, 1793, 1794, *and* 1795, *de-* " *ſcribed in a Series of Letters from an Engliſh* " *Lady.*" 2 *vols.* 8*vo.*

Vol. ii. *Page* 14.—The whole town of Bedouin, in the South of France, was burnt purſuant to a decree of the Convention, to expiate the imprudence of ſome of its inhabitants in having cut down a dead tree of liberty. Above ſixty people were guillotined as accomplices, and their bodies thrown into pits, dug by order of the Repreſentative Maignet, then on miſſion, before their death. Theſe executions were ſucceeded by a conflagration of all the houſes, and the impriſonment or diſperſion of their poſſeſſors. It is likewiſe worthy of remark, that many of theſe laſt were obliged, by expreſs order of Maignet, to be ſpectators of the murder of their friends and relations.

Pages 55, 56.—The following is the Copy of a Letter

Letter addreſſed to the Mayor of Paris, by a Commiſſary of the Government at Angers:

" You will give us pleaſure by tranſmitting the " details of your fête at Paris laſt decade, with the " hymns that were ſung. Here we all cried, '*Vive* " *la République!*' as we ever do, when our holy mo- " ther Guillotine is at work. Within theſe three " days ſhe has ſhaved eleven prieſts, one *ci-devant* " noble, a nun, a general, and a ſuperb Engliſh- " man, ſix feet high; and as he was too tall by a " head, we have put that into a ſack. At the ſame " time eight hundred rebels were ſhot at the Pont " de Cé, and their carcaſſes thrown into the Loire! " I underſtand the army is on the track of the run- " aways. All we overtake we ſhoot on the ſpot, " and in ſuch numbers that the ways are heaped " with them."

About this time a woman who ſold newſpapers, and the printer of them, were guillotined for paragraphs deemed *inciviques*.

Page 100.—A farmer was guillotined, becauſe ſome blades of corn appeared growing in one of his ponds; from which circumſtance it was inferred that he had thrown in a large quantity, in order to promote a ſcarcity; though it was ſubſtantially proved on his trial, that at the preceding harveſt the grain of an adjoining field had been got in during a high wind, and that in all probability ſome ſcattered ears which reached the water had produced what was deemed ſufficient teſtimony to convict him. Another underwent the ſame puniſhment for purſuing his uſual courſe of tillage, and growing part of his ground with lucerne, inſtead of devoting the whole to wheat.

Pages 121, 122, 123.—I have already noticed the cruel and ferocious temper of Le Bon, and the maſſacres of his tribunals are already well known. I will only add ſome circumſtances which not only may

may be conſidered as characteriſtic of this tyrant, but of the times, and I fear I may add, of the people, who ſuffered and even applauded them. They are ſelected from many others not ſuſceptible of being deſcribed in language fit for an Engliſh reader.

Being one day amuſing himſelf, as uſual, with a ſight of the *guillotinage*, where ſeveral had already ſuffered, one of the victims having, from a very natural emotion, averted his eyes, while he placed his body in the poſture required, the executioner perceived it, and going to the ſack which contained the heads of thoſe juſt ſacrificed, took one out, and with the moſt horrid imprecations obliged the unhappy wretch to kiſs it: yet Le Bon not only permitted, but ſanctioned this, by dining daily with the hangman. He was afterwards reproached with this familiarity in the Convention, but defended himſelf by ſaying—"A ſimilar act of Lequinio's was inſert-"ed by your orders in the bulletin with honourable "mention, and your decrees have invariably conſe-"crated the principles on which I acted." They all felt for a moment the dominion of conſcience, and were ſilent. On another occaſion, he ſuſpended an execution, while the ſavages, whom he kept in pay, threw dirt on the priſoners, and inſulted them previous to their ſuffering.

When any of his colleagues paſſed through Arras, he always propoſed their joining with him in a "partie de guillotine;" and the executions were perpetrated in a ſmall ſquare at Arras, rather than in the great one, that himſelf, his wife and relations, might more commodiouſly enjoy the ſpectacle from the balcony of the theatre, where they took their coffee, attended by a band of muſic, which played while this human butchery laſted.

The Convention, the Committees, all France, were well acquainted with the conduct of Le Bon. He himſelf began to fear he might have exceeded the limits

limits of his commiſſion; and upon communicating ſome ſcruples of this kind to his employers, received the following letters, which, though they do not exculpate him, certainly render the Committee of Public Welfare more criminal than himſelf.

"CITIZEN,

"The Committee of Public Welfare approve the meaſures you have adopted, at the ſame time that they deem the warrant which you ſolicit to be unneceſſary; ſuch meaſures being not only allowable, but enjoined by the very nature of your miſſion. No conſideration ought to ſtand in the way of your revolutionary progreſs. Give free ſcope therefore to your energy; the powers you are inveſted with are unlimited, and *whatever* you may deem conducive to the public good, you are free, you are even called upon by duty, to carry into execution without delay. We here tranſmit you an order of the Committee, by which your powers are extended to the neighbouring departments. Armed with ſuch means, and with your energy, you will go on to confound the enemies of the Republic, with the very ſchemes they have projected for its deſtruction.

"CARNOT.
"BARRERE.
"R. LINDET."

Extract from another Letter, ſigned Billaud-Varennes, Carnot, and Barrere.

"There is no commutation for offences againſt a republic. Death alone can expiate them! Purſue the traitors with fire and ſword; and continue to march with courage in the revolutionary track you have deſcribed."

Page 176.—So late as the 7th Thermidor (July 25), Barrere made a pompous eulogium on Robeſpierre, and in a long account on the ſtate of the country, he acknowledges that "ſome little clouds "hang over the political horizon, but they will ſoon

" be diſperſed, by the union which ſubſiſts in the " Committees; above all, by a more ſpeedy trial " and execution of revolutionary criminals." It is difficult to imagine what new means of diſpatch this airy barbarian had contrived; for, in the ſix months preceding this harangue, *twelve hundred and fifty* had been guillotined in Paris *alone*.

Page 158.—It was Tallien's boaſt to have guillotined none but ariſtocrats; and of this part of his merit I am willing to leave him in poſſeſſion. At Toulon he was charged with the puniſhment of thoſe who had given up the town to the Engliſh; but finding, as he alleged, nearly all the inhabitants involved, he ſelected about two hundred of the richeſt; and, that the horrid buſineſs might wear an appearance of regularity, the *patriots*, that is, the moſt notorious *Jacobins*, were ordered to give their opinion on the guilt of theſe victims, who were brought out into an open field for that purpoſe. With ſuch judges the ſentence was ſoon paſſed, and a *fuſillade* took place on the ſpot. It was on this occaſion that Tallien made particular boaſt of his humanity; and in the ſame publication wherein he relates the circumſtance, he expoſes the *atrocious conduct* of the Engliſh at Toulon. The cruelty of theſe barbarians not being ſufficiently gratified by diſpatching their victims the ſhorteſt way, they hung up many of them by their chins, on hooks at the ſhambles, and left them to die at their leiſure. See "Mitrailades, Fuſillades," a recriminating pamphlet, addreſſed by Tallien to Collot d'Herbois. The title alludes to Collot's exploits at Lyons.

Page 174.—The Mareſchalle de Biron, a very old and infirm woman, was taken to the Luxembourg at Paris, where her daughter-in-law, the Dutcheſs, was alſo confined. A cart arriving at that priſon to convey a number of victims to the tribunal, the liſt, in the coarſe dialect of republicaniſm, contained the name

name of La Femme Biron. "But there are two of "them," ſaid the keeper: "Then bring them both." The aged Mareſchalle, who was at ſupper, concluded her meal while the reſt were preparing, then took up her book of devotion, and departed cheerfully. The next day both mother and daughter were guillotined.

Page 200.—The Revolutionary Tribunal continues ſentencing people to death, on pretexts as frivolous as in the time of Robeſpierre; they have only the advantage of being tried more formally, and of forfeiting their lives upon proof, inſtead of without it, for actions that a ſtrictly adminiſtered juſtice would not puniſh by a month's impriſonment: for inſtance, a young Monk, for writing *fanatic* letters, and ſigning reſolutions in favour of federaliſm; a hoſier, for facilitating the return of an emigrant; a man of ninety, for ſpeaking againſt the revolution, and diſcrediting the aſſignats; a contractor, for embezzling forage; people of various deſcriptions, for obſtructing the recruitment, or inſulting the tree of liberty. Theſe and many ſimilar condemnations will be found in the proceedings of the Revolutionary Tribunal, long after the death of *Robeſpierre*, and when *juſtice* and *humanity* were ſaid to be reſtored.

Page 215, 216, 217.—Though the horror excited by ſuch atrocious details muſt be ſerviceable to humanity, I am conſtrained by decency to ſpare the reader a part of them. Let the imagination, however repugnant, pauſe for a moment over theſe ſcenes. Five, or eight hundred people, of different ſexes, ages, and conditions, are taken from their priſons in the dreary months of December and January, and conducted, during the ſilence of the night, to the banks of the Loire. The agents of the Republic there, deſpoil them of their clothes, and force them, ſhivering and defenceleſs, to enter the

machines prepared for their deſtruction. They are chained down, to prevent their eſcape by ſwimming, and then the bottom is detached from the upper part, and ſunk. On ſome occaſions, the miſerable victims contrived to looſe themſelves, and clinging to the boats near them, ſhrieked in the agonies of deſpair and death, "Oh ſave us! it is not even now "too late; in mercy ſave us!" But they appealed to wretches to whom mercy was a ſtranger; and being cut away from their hold by ſtrokes of the ſabre, they periſhed with their companions. That nothing might be wanting to theſe outrages againſt nature, they were deſcribed as jeſts, and called *noyades*, *water-parties*, and *civic baptiſms! Carrier*, a Deputy of the Convention, uſed to dine and make parties of pleaſure, accompanied by muſic, and every ſpecies of groſs luxury, on board the barges appropriated to thoſe execrable purpoſes.

At one time ſix hundred children appear to have been drowned; ſix young people of both ſexes were tied in pairs and thrown into the river; thouſands were ſhot on the high roads and in the fields; and vaſt numbers were guillotined without a trial! Six young women, in particular, ſiſters, and all under four-and-twenty, were ordered to the guillotine together: the youngeſt died inſtantly of fear, the reſt were executed ſucceſſively.—A child eleven years old, who had previouſly told the executioner, with affecting ſimplicity, that he hoped he would not hurt him much, received three ſtrokes of the guillotine before his head was ſevered from his body!

Two thouſand perſons died in leſs than two months of a peſtilence, occaſioned by this carnage: the air became infected, and the waters of the Loire impoiſoned by dead bodies; and thoſe whom tyranny yet ſpared, periſhed by the elements which nature intended for their ſupport.

Vaſt ſums were exacted from the *Nantais* for purifying the air, and taking precautions againſt epidemical diſorders.

This black liſt of enormities might be extended almoſt *ad infinitum*, but it is deemed expedient to cloſe it, at leaſt for the preſent, with the confeſſion of a ſtaunch advocate for the French revolution, a conſtitution-monger, a legiſlator, and a judge—in ſhort, no leſs a perſonage than *Thomas Paine*, who, in his malignant attack upon General Waſhington, for the firſt time in his life ſtumbled upon *the truth*. "To ſuch a pitch of rage and ſuſpicion was Robe-"ſpierre and his Committee"(of which be it obſerved, *Carnot*, the actual Preſident of the Directory, was a leading member) "arrived, that it ſeemed as if they "feared to leave a man alive. *No man could count* "*upon his life for twenty hours*. One hundred and "ſixty-nine priſoners were taken out of the Luxem-"bourg in one night, and one hundred and ſixty of "them were guillotined. In the next liſt, I have "good reaſon to believe *I was included*."—FINIS CORONAT OPUS.

THE END OF THE BLOODY BUOY.

THE

CENSOR:

OR, A REVIEW OF

POLITICAL OCCURRENCES

RELATIVE TO THE

UNITED STATES

OF

AMERICA.

POLITICAL CENSOR.

No. II.

THE reader will please to recollect, that, in the First Number of the Censor, I brought down the proceedings in the House of Representatives to the 5th of January, the memorable day of the exhibition of the French flag. I should not now have thought of returning to the same subject, had I not been led to it by an attack on the President, in the anarchical Aurora of Philadelphia.

One would have thought that giving this flag a place among the *archives* of the United States would have been conferring honour enough upon it; but nothing would content the French-Americans, who write in the paper I have just mentioned, short of its being hoisted in the Congress Chamber, as a trophy of the victory of French influence. They cite us the example of the Convention: but let them say under what circumstances, and with what motive, our flag was granted a conspicuous place in their hall. It was dishonoured by being swung up, gibbeted up, by the side of the flag of *regenerated* Geneva; a state in which the Convention had established their system of pillage and murder, and which they treated as a conquered country rather than as an *independent* ally. To add to our humiliation, a duplicate, as I may call it, of our flag was sent to Geneva, and there exhibited in the Convention of a poor little degraded nation of thirty thousand bodies, I will not call them souls. This was saying to the Genevese, See, you are not the only

people who have thrown themſelves on our protecting power, and ſent us a pledge of their ſubmiſſion to our principles.

Thus, by the indiſcretion (to give it the mildeſt term) of our ambaſſador, have we been degraded in the eyes of even *Italians*, and expoſed to the gibes of the little ſcandalizing circles of the leaſt reſpectable people in Europe: and, in return for this cruel inſult, we are called upon to diſtinguiſh the flag of the Convention with a place in the public ſittings of our Legiſlature, and by this act acknowledge ourſelves the ſupple tools of our inſulters!—This is modern patriotiſm.

Debate on the Appropriations for the Mint.

January 19th.

Mr. WILLIAMS, agreeably to notice before given, moved to ſtrike out of the Appropriation Bill all the groſs ſum appropriated for the officers of the Mint.

Mr. SEDGWICK (from *Maſſachuſetts)* thought that the courſe which the Gentleman is purſuing has never been adopted before. It is incorrect to diſcuſs the merits of the Mint in paſſing this bill. We might as well take up the ſalary of the Chief Juſtice, or any other article in the bill, as the Mint. We never would have done at this rate. We are now only to vote for the bill, as agreeable to the laws already made. Mr. Sedgwick ſaid, that if the Gentleman from New-York (Mr. Williams) would bring forward any propoſition for the regulation, or even the abolition, of the eſtabliſhment of the Mint, if it could be proved productive of public benefit, he, with every other Gentleman, would give him their aid to effect the object; but that now, he conceived, it could not regularly be brought forward. He thought an appropriation bill ſhould be conformed exactly to the ſtate of the public engagements, and that

that where eſtabliſhments had been formed and ſalaries provided, the amount of them ſhould be the principle of calculating the amount of appropriations; and the Houſe ought not, by withholding appropriations, to break in upon and deſtroy eſtabliſhments formed by the whole Legiſlature. That theſe obſervations had hitherto been ſanctioned by the practice on this ſubject. He obſerved, that if the Houſe was to inveſtigate, in the diſcuſſion of an appropriation bill, the amount of ſalaries and the legal eſtabliſhments of Government, the public ſervice would be dangerouſly deſtroyed. He remarked, that it was to be obſerved that no appropriation was made, for any purpoſe, ſince the commencement of the year.

Mr. GALLATIN (from *Geneva)* roſe to ſtate a general principle, which he thought it of importance to lay down on this occaſion, leſt the deciſion on the preſent queſtion, grounded on a different principle, ſhould, on ſome future occaſion, be brought forward. The principle was, *that this Houſe has a right, by withholding appropriations when they ſee proper, to ſtop the wheels of Government.* This, he ſaid, was plainly to be inferred from the practice of the Houſe, in their paſſing annually an appropriation law. He obſerved, that in one inſtance the Houſe had departed from that principle. In reſpect to the payment of the intereſt on the public debt, for the ſupport of the public credit, the Houſe had thought it neceſſary to give up that right. If this principle is not juſt, it would be beſt to make a permanent proviſion at once.

Mr. SEDGWICK ſaid, that he had certainly no intention to have given occaſion to the obſervations which had been made; but as the general principle which he had laid down had been denied, and as it had ſome relation, either intimate or remote, to the ſubject before the Committee, he would take the liberty

liberty to repeat the principle, and to ſay a few words in ſupport of it.

The principle, then, which he had aſſumed, was, that when legal eſtabliſhments were made, it was the duty of the Legiſlature to make appropriations conformably to the public engagements, and that neither branch had a right to withhold its aſſent. He obſerved, that the whole Legiſlature, and not a part, were competent to form contracts, and to eſtabliſh and alter compenſations and ſalaries. The Legiſlature, and not either branch of it, had the power of expreſſing the public will, and pledging the public faith: that when a ſalary is aſcertained, the public faith is pledged that it ſhall be paid according to the ſtipulation; and that therefore the public credit is involved in making the neceſſary appropriations, without which it could not be paid. He aſked, if in ſuch caſe it was competent to the Houſe rightfully to withhold the means neceſſary for the performance of the public engagements.

He ſaid, he had always ſuppoſed that the power of the Houſe, in the caſe of appropriations, did not give a power to yield or withhold aſſent on ſuch a ſubject. He believed in every ſuch inſtance the exerciſe of diſcretion was reſtrained. To illuſtrate his ideas, he could mention a ſimilar inſtance. The Conſtitution had declared, that the Preſident ſhould receive a ſtated compenſation for his ſervices, to be aſcertained by law, which could neither be diminiſhed nor enlarged during the term for which he ſhould have been elected. Here was a duty impoſed on the Legiſlature, with the performance of which they could not, they had no power to diſpenſe. Yet after the compenſation was ſtated, no payment could be made but in conſequence of appropriating. He aſked, if, in this caſe, when the public will was expreſſed, the engagement and the national faith pledged, the Legiſlature could of right withhold the neceſſary

neceſſary appropriation? The ſame obſervations might, he ſaid, be applied to every inſtance where public controls were formed. The public faith was pledged; the neceſſary appropriations muſt be made to prevent a violation of it, and, if withheld, ſuch violation might juſtly be charged on the Legiſlature.

Here a long converſation took place with reſpect to the expediency of the propoſed meaſure, on the advantages and diſadvantages of a Mint, &c. After which Mr. *Livingſton*, whom we ſhall by and by ſee making a conſiderable figure in the field of oppoſition to the Government, made a motion *for the ſtriking out the whole appropriation for the Mint.*

Mr. MURRAY (from *Maryland)* ſaid, that had the Gentleman from New-York moved for delay, for the purpoſe of introducing a motion to repeal the law which rendered this appropriation neceſſary, he would not have troubled the Houſe with a ſingle remark; but his motion to ſtrike out an appropriation, for the purpoſe of bringing the policy of the law itſelf into diſcuſſion, contained a principle in his mind ſo repugnant to the great legiſlative duties of the Houſe, that he would oppoſe it. The object of the appropriation is not a temporary one, but a part of the machinery of our Government, under the expreſs authority of the Conſtitution, by law. The doctrine now contended for by the Gentlemen from New-York and Pennſylvania (Mr. Livingſton and Mr. Gallatin) was, that this Houſe have a diſcretionary power of appropriating, or not. To this doctrine, taken in the extent which he conceived they contended for, he could not give his ſupport. On the contrary, he thought, that in all caſes where an appropriation flowed from a law to make good a contract, or to erect a permanent organ in the Government, and from any law whoſe object was permanent, the true doctrine was, that it was the duty of the Houſe to vote an appropriation. A law is the

will

will of the nation: the ſame powers only that formed it can repeal it. If it be a conſtitutional act, no power can lawfully obſtruct its operation or its exiſtence. But attending to the doctrine maintained to-day, it would follow, that though this Houſe had not the power of repealing a law made by all the branches of Government, it may obſtruct its operations and render it a dead letter: though it cannot repeal, it may do what ſhall amount to a repeal, which is the aſſumption of a power almoſt equal to that of excluſive legiſlation. He thought he ſaw in this an evil of great extent, and an anarchy of theoretic principles. It appeared to him, that though we originate money-bills, we had no right to refuſe an appropriation to exiſting laws that either ſecured a debt or any contract, or that related to objects permanent by the law that created or acknowledged them, as long as the law itſelf remained unrepealed. We had but a ſhare of legiſlative power. Where a law, relative to ſuch objects as he had alluded to, exiſted, from which an appropriation followed till the law ceaſed, by repeal or by other conſtitutional means, it was obligatory upon us, as well as upon our conſtituents; and the only powers we could exerciſe, of a diſcretionary ſort, reſolved themſelves either into the mode of making good the appropriation, or of voting for its repeal. The other branches would then judge of the propriety of our proceeding; but till they, who aſſiſted in its enacting, judged with us the neceſſity of doing it away, a duty reſulted that we ſhould give it the energy intended by its enaction.

The appropriation for the Mint was finally paſſed.

Remarks.—The firſt three items in the Appropriation Bill were as follows:

For

	Dollars.
For compenſation to the Preſident of the United States - - -	25,000
To the Vice-preſident - - -	5,000
To the Members of the Senate - -	38,000

Now, would it not have been much the ſhorteſt way for Mr. *Livingſton* to move for ſtriking out theſe three items? This would have been coming to the mark at once. By only three ſtrokes of the "*Calm Obſerver*'s" pen, the free, the independent, the beneficent Government of the United States might have been changed into a National Convention; and in the ſame number of days we might have ſeen our ſtreets patrolled by revolutionary ruffians, our property expoſed to requiſitions and our heads to the guillotine.

But it is not my intention to enter into the merits of a motion at once the height of malevolence and abſurdity; I have introduced this debate merely to have an opportunity of introducing the principle laid down by Mr. *Gallatin*, and Mr. *Gallatin* along with it.

This gentleman tells us, that the Houſe of Repreſentatives "have a right, by withholding appro-" priations *when they ſee proper*, to *ſtop the wheels of* " *Government*." I ſhould be glad to know where he learnt this: whether from his companions in Braddock's Field, or from their correſpondents, the corrupted *flour-merchants* in Philadelphia. They, indeed, were well verſed in ſtopping the wheels of Government by the agency of *appropriations*.

When Mr. Gallatin roſe from his ſeat to broach this clogging principle, there was an old farmer ſitting beſide me, to whom the perſon of the orator ſeemed familiar: "Ah, ah!" ſays he, "what's " little Moſes in Congreſs?" I ſharply reprimanded him for taking one of our repreſentatives for a Jew; but, to confeſs a truth, the Gentleman from *Geneva* has an accent not unlike that of a wandering Iſraelite.

It is neither Italian, German, nor French; and were it not a ſort of leze republicaniſm, I would ſay he clipped the King's Engliſh moſt unmerciſully. Such an accent is admirably adapted for extolling the value of leaden buckles, or for augmenting the diſcordant howlings of a ſynagogue; but it throws a certain air of ridicule over the debates of a legiſlative aſſembly, and forms a ſort of burleſque on the harmonious eloquence of the other members.

When I told the good jog-trot to take care what he was ſaying, for that the perſonage then on his legs was no other than the great Gallatin, he opened his eyes, and with a look and voice expreſſive of an honeſt indignation, "What!" ſays he, "that ſame Gal-"latin who was one of the leaders in the weſtern "inſurrection?" I could not help ſmiling at the ſimplicity of my country friend, in not perceiving that ſuch a circumſtance was the higheſt proof of Mr. Gallatin's patriotiſm, and the only one that recommended him to the ſuffrages of his conſtituents. "No wonder," ſays the farmer, "that he wants to "ſtop the wheels of Government. I wiſh he'd at-"tempt to ſtop the wheels of my waggon as I am "going down hill." God forgive me, but I believe I ſaid *Amen*.

Mr. Gallatin has been accuſed of inconſiſtency; but here I cannot join the enemies of that gentleman. Whatever a man may be, I love to do him ample juſtice. This is a principle ſo ſtrongly imprinted in my breaſt, that it induces me to undertake the defence of Mr. Gallatin's conſiſtency, though I have not the higheſt reſpect for his general conduct or for his character.

We might follow this gentleman through his political career from the day of his diſembarkation to the preſent ſeſſion of Congreſs; but it will not, I imagine, be neceſſary to go further back than the weſtern rebellion.

So

So early as the 21ſt of July, 1791, we find him Clerk to a meeting for oppoſing the exciſe law, or, in other words, " ſtopping the wheels of Govern- " ment."—On the 21ſt of April, 1792, we find this adjourned meeting declaring, " That whereas " ſome men may be found among us, ſo far loſt to " every ſenſe of virtue, and feeling for the diſtreſſes " of our country, as to accept the office for the " collection of the duty;

" Reſolved, therefore, that in future we will " conſider ſuch perſons as unworthy of our friend- " ſhip, have no intercourſe or dealings with them, " withdraw from them every aſſiſtance, and *with-* " *hold all the comforts of life*, which depend upon " thoſe duties which as men and fellow-citizens we " owe to each other, and upon all occaſions treat " them with that contempt they deſerve; and that " it be, and it is hereby moſt earneſtly *recommended* " *to the people at large*, to follow the ſame line of " conduct towards them."

Thus, then, I think here is no inconſiſtency; no change of principles. The man that could draw up a reſolution like this, cannot be ſaid to have abandoned his principles, when he declares that the Houſe of Repreſentatives may ſtop the wheels of Government, when they ſee proper, by withholding appropriations.

It is ſaid, indeed, that Mr. Gallatin has ſince repented of his inſurrection conduct, that he called the above-quoted reſolution his " political ſin," and we all know that he ſigned a promiſe of ſubmiſſion to the laws; but let it be remembered, that he never talked about this political ſin, until he came down to Philadelphia, and that his promiſe of ſubmiſſion to the laws was not made, until he ſaw that reſiſtance was in vain, and that it was the only way of availing himſelf of the amneſty, and ſaving his carcaſs from a loathſome dungeon. And, if he did

leave

leave his poor deluded adherents in the lurch, and even ſacrifice them to his own ſafety, this is no more than every rebellious ringleader is ready to do, when the moment of danger arrives. It is by no means a proof of inconſiſtency in the Gentleman from Geneva. It is, to uſe the words of a late political writer, "*varying his means* to preſerve the *unity of his* "*end.*" When overturning a government, or ſtopping its wheels, is the ſole object of a patriot, ſo long as he keeps ſteadily towards the point, whether by open rebellion, confeſſing his political ſin, pretending ſubmiſſion, lurching his aſſociates, or withholding appropriations, he can never be juſtly charged with inconſiſtency.

Debate on the Appointment of a Stenographer.

January 29th.

On the 28th a report of the Stenographical Committee was given in, ſpecifying that the Committee had received propoſals from Mr. *David Robertſon* of Virginia, whoſe demand for one ſeſſion was 4000 dollars. The report became the order of the day for the 29th, when a reſolution was propoſed in favour of the appointment.

I ſhall chooſe from this debate what fell from Mr. Swanwick and Mr. William Smith, as appearing to me to compriſe nearly all that was urged on both ſides.

Mr. SWANWICK (from *Pennſylvania).* As to the gentleman who is the ſubject of the reſolution, if I have more ſtrenuouſly than uſual oppoſed the motion, it is from a deſire to keep him from quitting the lucrative ſituation he is ſaid to find himſelf in, to embark on the ſtormy ſea he is contemplating. To be the organ of the members of this Houſe to their conſtituents is indeed a very delicate taſk; one for which, conſidering the danger he might be in of an

an Orpheus's fate, that of being torn to pieces, the ſalary is but a poor compenſation. He is to do juſtice to the eloquence of ſome members—he is to clothe in an elegant dreſs the uncouth, yet well-meaning expreſſions of others. But what will he do with the ſilent members, who never ſpeak at all?—What will their conſtituents think of them? Indeed, Sir, if he had the idea I have formed of his danger, he will not undertake at all. Faction and party have been mentioned—happy Stenographer, if he can keep clear of theſe! If he fall into their power, inſenſibly he will repreſent one ſide in clouds and darkneſs, the other as ornamented with the brighteſt beams of light. How will he pleaſe both? Miſrepreſentation is complained of: alas, Sir, how quick is error, how ſlow is the progreſs of truth in almoſt all things! Our Stenographer muſt indeed be a wonder-working man, if he can revert this tide, and make every where light, and correct reaſoning prevail. The beſt mode of informing our conſtituents is by the Yeas and Nays on our acts; this truly ſhows, as a gentleman from New-Hampſhire has obſerved, our doings, which are much more intereſting to them than our abſtract reaſonings; theſe our conſtituents will eaſily form to themſelves ideas of when they know our votes.

Mr. W. Lyman *(Maſſachuſetts)* ſaid, that if this reſolution did not paſs, *it would be adviſable to ſend all the Printers to the gallery.*

Mr. W. Smith *(South Carolina)* ſaid it was admitted on all ſides, that it was highly important for the people to receive the moſt accurate information of the proceedings of the Houſe, and that the debates were in general extremely miſrepreſented. Was it not then the duty of the Houſe to remedy this evil, and to adopt ſuch meaſures as would tranſmit to the people in every part of the United States, the moſt accurate information of the conduct of their repre-

ſentatives? The Houſe had now an opportunity of obtaining the ſervices of a gentleman peculiarly diſtinguiſhed for the rare talent of reporting with accuracy public debates: the compenſation which would be adequate to ſuch uſeful and laborious ſervice was beyond the ability of any printer; the Houſe ought therefore to contribute towards it. The ſum required was a trifle when compared with the advantages; it was no object: the only queſtion then was, whether the Stenographer ought to be an officer of the Houſe; in that capacity he certainly would be more eaſily reſtrained from the commiſſion of any wilful miſrepreſentation. Mr. Smith did not feel the force of the objections againſt the report. It had been ſaid, that although the members were now miſrepreſented, yet they had it in their power to publiſh corrections; but theſe corrections were often overlooked, while the miſrepreſentation was operating very injuriouſly to the character of the Member: this was generally the caſe in places remote from the ſeat of government; the mangled account of a debate was republiſhed in a diſtant paper, and the correction, if it reached the diſtant printer, was generally diſregarded. Among the opponents to the report, Mr. Smith ſaid that he was ſurpriſed to find the gentleman who repreſented this city (Mr. Swanwick), who more than any other Member ſhould have withdrawn his oppoſition to the meaſure propoſed: that gentleman's conſtituents had it in their power at any time to hear the debates of Congreſs: they were on the ſpot; ought he not then in candour to aſſiſt in facilitating to the remote citizens the means of obtaining the beſt knowledge of the proceedings, and the moſt correct ſtatement of the diſcuſſions of the Houſe? ought they, from their remoteneſs, to be kept in the dark, or to be furniſhed with ſuch light as would only miſlead? Had they not a claim on the Houſe to adopt

adopt ſuch means as would enable the citizens in every State to judge of the propriety of public meaſures? The Member from this city had another excluſive advantage; if miſrepreſented, he could correct the error, and the correction will be read; that was not the caſe with the members of remoter States, whoſe reputation might be injured by miſrepreſentation without a ſimilar advantage: the Member from this city was in the midſt of his conſtituents; he had daily opportunities of ſetting right any miſtatement by perſonal explanation.

Mr. SMITH ſaid he did not agree with ſome gentlemen, that it was ſufficient for the people to know what laws were paſſed, without knowing the previous diſcuſſions; he thought, on the contrary, the favourable or unfavourable impreſſion of a law on the public mind would depend in a great degree on the reaſons aſſigned for and againſt it in debates, and the people ought to know thoſe reaſons. When a law paſſes impoſing a tax, would not the people be reconciled, if they ſaw, from the diſcuſſions of the Houſe, that ſuch tax was unavoidable, and that the particular mode of taxation was the beſt which could be deviſed? And ought this information to depend entirely on the caprice or convenience of the reporters, who attended when it pleaſed them, and who publiſhed juſt as much of the debates as they found leiſure or patience to accompliſh? Mr. Smith ſaid, he was convinced that the errors which had excited ſo much complaint were not the effect of deſign, but merely of inadequacy to the taſk; very few were competent to ſuch a buſineſs, which required peculiar ſkill in ſtenography, very laborious application, and a clear comprehenſion of the ſubject matter of debate. It could not be expected that perſons thus qualified would devote their whole time to this buſineſs without an ample reward. The report was objected to becauſe there was novelty in

the plan; it was true the Houſe of Commons of England had no ſuch officer, but their practice was not a fit precedent for us on this occaſion, for they admitted no perſon to write down in the Houſe their proceedings; their debates were taken from memory. This Houſe on the contrary had, from its firſt inſtitution, facilitated, by every accommodation, the reporting their proceedings. The thing was not altogether however without precedent; during the exiſtence of the National Aſſembly of France there were officers of the Houſe who compoſed a daily work called the Logography, which was an exact account of the debates of that body. It had been aſked, what control the Houſe were to have over this officer? He anſwered, that the Stenographer would be liable to be cenſured or diſplaced, if he ſhould be guilty of wilful miſrepreſentation; it would be always eaſy to diſcriminate between a caſual inadvertence, and a criminal miſtatement: the officer's character and talents, his reſponſibility to the Houſe, and his oath to report with impartiality, would be a ſufficient pledge of his accuracy. Mr. Smith ſeriouſly believed, that the character of the Houſe had ſuffered from the erroneous ſtatements which had gone abroad; he wiſhed to guard againſt this evil in future; he was willing, for himſelf, that every ſyllable he uttered within thoſe walls ſhould be carried to every part of the Union, but he deprecated miſrepreſentation. He was anxious that the truth ſhould be known, in relation to every act of the Government; for he was as ſatisfied that the affection and confidence of the people in this Government would increaſe with the promulgation of truth, as that whatever it had loſt of that affection and confidence was owing altogether to the propagation of detraction and calumny. It was under theſe impreſſions that he had originally brought forward the propoſition, and that he now recommended the report;

port; and having heard no reaſons to change his ſentiments of the expediency of the meaſure, he ſhould perſiſt in ſupporting it.

The Committee of the whole was diſcharged from any further conſideration of the ſubject.

REMARKS.—The Houſe had nearly got upon a rock here, which they would have found it difficult to get off from in ſafety. Perhaps there was never a reſolution propoſed, at once ſo apparently trifling and ſo pregnant with miſchief. Let any man reflect for a moment on the ſtate of parties in this country, and he will look with affright at the appointment of an officer, inveſted with the power of diſfiguring every argument, and even every phraſe, that a Member of the Legiſlature may let fall. The gentlemen who ſupported the reſolution, talk of his being ſworn; and did we live in thoſe good old times, when oaths were ſuperior to the ſpirit of party, the argument would be unanſwerable: but, alas! thoſe times are no more. Oaths on the Evangeliſts are, in this *enlightened* age, little more than mockery. The members of the preſent Congreſs have every man of them ſworn to maintain the Conſtitution of the United States, and yet how many of them do we ſee at this moment, ſtraining every faculty of the mind to render it null and void? What then could be hoped from a Stenographer?

Were a perfect ſtranger to liſten to a debate, he would contract a partiality for one ſide or the other, before it was half over. Every man in a popular government has his party; and who can ſuppoſe that the Stenographer would not have his? It was ſaid that the Houſe had a check upon him, in their power to diſmiſs him from his office. But this muſt be done by a vote of the Houſe, and therefore it could be no defence for a Member who had the misfortune to find himſelf in a minority.

Indeed, this power of diſmiſſion is one of the worſt parts of the plan; for, as the Stenographer would be loath to quit ſo lucrative an employment, he would of neceſſity be led to preſerve a majority in his favour; and what would be ſo ſure a way of doing this as miſrepreſenting the ſpeeches of the minority? A Member might complain; but the Stenographer, ſecure in his majority, would laugh at him. Thus might a man of talents and integrity be officially repreſented as a fool or a knave, without having the poſſibility of redreſs. In vain would he endeavour to juſtify himſelf: the ſworn Stenographer would be believed before him, and the Houſe, by a ſolemn deciſion, would determine that he had ſaid what he never dreamt of.

Should an officer like this ever enter the Houſe, it is eaſy to foreſee that he will not be long wanted. The very ſight of ſuch a tremendous umpire would frighten away all freedom of ſpeech. It is true the members of the majority might prattle away, but thoſe of the other ſide would naturally look upon themſelves in the ſituation of a man who is making a depoſition. One party only would dare to open their mouths. Where there is no oppoſition there can be no debate, and, of courſe, no need of a Stenographer.

Mr. Smith's objection to citing the example of the Britiſh Houſe of Commons on this occaſion did not appear to me well-founded. They permit no one to write down their words after them; yet I believe it will be allowed that their debates are very well reported; and this is a pretty good proof that an officer for that purpoſe is by no means neceſſary.

This gentleman mentioned the officers of the *Logography* employed by the ſecond National Aſſembly in France. Unfortunate inſtance! The French Conſtitution, that "maſter-piece of legiſ-"lation," which was to laſt as long as the round world,

world, lafted only ten months and ten days; and, among the engines by which it was deftroyed, the office of the Logography claims a conſpicuous place. There were ten of theſe reporters. They wrote in the literal character: one took the firſt ſentence, another the ſecond, and ſo on. Ten men were much more difficult to warp and corrupt than one would be, and yet we ever ſee them the decided tools of the ſtrongeſt party. Members complained of miſrepreſentations, and had the ſatisfaction to ſee their complaints ſtill more disfigured than their ſpeeches. The conſequence was, the few real friends of the conſtitution were obliged to hold their tongues, and ſuffer the inflammatory harangues of their opponents to go forth among the people uncontradicted.

I never like to hear the examples of foreign governments applied to our own, particularly the examples of what is called the Government of France. I was aſtoniſhed that a gentleman of Mr. Smith's good ſenſe and good intentions ſhould hold up for our imitation, or even mention as an inſtance, one of the moſt inſidious meaſures of an Aſſembly, who were guilty of every crime under heaven; who, after having repeatedly ſworn to defend with their lives, the inviolability of their ſovereign, coolly planned an inſurrection to hurl him from his throne, afterwards made this very inſurrection the ſubject of an article of accuſation againſt him, and decreed that their own *perjury was a virtue!*

Mr. Lyman's hint for driving all the printers out of the Houſe, *unleſs the reſolution paſſed*, was a ſtriking inſtance of the domineering ſpirit, which would infallibly have overborne any Stenographer who had been unfortunate enough to accept of the poſt.

This hint broke out, ſome days after, in the form of a reſolution, from the lips of *Mr. Heath* of Virginia—"Reſolved, that, until a Stenographer be

" appointed, or further provision made for taking " the debates of this House, *no printer be permitted* " *to publish abstracts of the speeches of members, unless* " *permitted by members making the same.*" This was the substance of the resolution, and a curious one it is.

These gentlemen seem to have been determined to force their harangues, at full length, down our throats, or to keep us in a sort of political starvation. We must either swallow them by dozens of yards, as buffoons do ribands, or we must never have a taste.

I wonder where Mr. Lyman learnt a doctrine like this. Such an idea could certainly never be engendered in the free temperate air of Massachusetts. As to the Gentleman from Virginia, I am not surprised; for we know that when a sulky negro will not lick up his mess clean, however insipid, disgusting, and nauseous it may be, he is muzzled till his stomach comes to. But are we Pennsylvanians to be treated thus?—No, no, Mr. Heath; when you get the government on the other side of the Potomack, you may, and undoubtedly will, do what you please with it; but we have four years to live, at any rate; be not in such haste to muzzle us then.

Should this resolution ever reach the other side of the Atlantic, what idea will it give the English patriots of our liberty of the press? If a Member of the British House of Commons were to propose such a tyrannical resolution, I should not wonder to hear of his being stoned to death. Not publish abstracts from speeches without particular permission! The idea was certainly imported from the borders of the *Palus Meotis.*

Had these two gentlemen restricted the prohibition to their *own speeches*, I believe that neither the House nor the public would have cared much about the

the matter; for neither of them is of the Ciceronian ſtamp. It is obſervable, that thoſe who appeared moſt anxious for the appointment of a Stenographer, if we except one or two, are amongſt the few whoſe ſpeeches can do them no ſort of credit with any party. This is the way of the world. Animals, whether endued with the faculty of ſpeech or not, ſeem to fly in the face of nature. The ugly woman is everlaſtingly at her glaſs; the owl thought her frightful brood the prettieſt little creatures in the world; and the inſipid orator, while his voice is drowned in the hemmings, coughings, and ſnorings of his drowſy audience, thinks he is uttering ſentences that ought to be written in letters of gold.

It was obſerved in the courſe of the debate, that, if the printers committed errors, gentlemen might write out their ſpeeches and ſend them to the preſs. To this Mr. Nichols replied, that he was above doing any ſuch thing.—For my part, I muſt confeſs, that, were I capable of making a ſpeech, I ſhould be too lazy to write it out for the newſpapers; but as to its being beneath a lawgiver, I ſhall ſay nothing; for we have an example before our eyes of a folio orator in the Houſe of Aſſembly of Pennſylvania, who is ſo far from thinking it beneath him to write out his ſpeeches, that he even reads them from his ſeat, like a ſchoolboy from his bench. I allude here to one *Doctor Morpheus*, who, finding his neighbours determined not to die under his hands, is now endeavouring to aſſaſſinate the State. The State, however, ſeems to partake of the obſtinacy of his neighbours, turning a deaf ear to all his preſcriptions. The bolus of ſedition which he had kneaded up for the Aſſembly, did, indeed, at firſt, operate as a provocative on ſome of the members from Whiſkyland; but, luckily, the ſoporific qualities of it ſoon became predominant, and, at laſt, abſolutely irreſiſtible. At the end of the ſecond paragraph

ragraph the Chairman was perceived to yawn, the third rocked him off, and the fourth laid the whole Aſſembly faſt aſleep. The fifth reached the door-keeper, at the further end of the paſſage; and before the ſixth was half finiſhed, an old woman who ſells apples at the gate, dropped from her ſtool. The political *Morpheus* continued to ſpread his poppies, till, perceiving the effects of his bolus, he ſlunk off home to his liver nippy and four crout.—Should this quack in politics as well as phyſic be ſuffered to continue his lectures, the Aſſembly of Pennſylvania may write over their doors, as the French do over thoſe of their burying-grounds: "This is the place of everlaſting ſleep *."

After this little trip to the Land of Nod, let us return to our Stenographer.

I by no means call in queſtion the virtue of Mr. Robertſon, the officer propoſed: on the contrary, I ſhould ſuppoſe his virtue muſt be very high; for like that of Fielding's poſtboy, it is very high priced. If it be equal to his modeſty, it is certainly beyond any thing reaſonably to be expected from a frail mortal. The humble demand of four thouſand dollars for the ſeſſion is not a great deal more than eight times as much as any Member of the Houſe receives. The very mention of ſuch a ſum cannot fail to bring forth ſwarms of ſtenographers, as a warm night at the playhouſe is ſaid to hatch comedians.

I cannot conclude this article without reminding gentlemen of their cruelty to my poor Caledonian friend, Callender. How was he mauled! how was his *Regiſter* torn to pieces! One took him by the wig, another by the ear; he writhed and winced and jumped about, as the French ſay, like a frog upon a gridiron. I much queſtion if he were in

* This paſſage alludes to Dr. Lieb.

greater

greater torture when the conſtables of Edinburgh were at his heels.—Oh! gentlemen from Virginia! how could you ſo belabour this imported patriot? A man that has not only forſworn his country, but has written, or rather tranſcribed, two whole "Political Progreſſes" purely to curry favour with you! Nay, he has even blaſphemed the Preſident, and juſtified the non-payment of debts; and yet, oh ingratitude! you could ſmile at his agonies! If this be the way you treat your friends, I hope I ſhall never be numbered amongſt them; at leaſt until your manners and principles change.

One gentleman expreſſed a good deal of anxiety, leſt the "Political Regiſter" ſhould deſcend to poſterity; but let him quiet his fears on this account; for, whether the ſpeeches which Callender has collected were *written out* or not, they are a more potent opiate than any drug that was ever pounded in the mortar of *Doctor Morpheus*; and that is ſaying a great deal, I am ſure.

Debate on Half an Hour's Adjournment.

February 22d.

Mr. SMITH (from *South Carolina)* moved, that the Houſe adjourn for *half an hour*, in order to give the members an opportunity of congratulating the Preſident of the United States *on the return of his birthday.*

Strange to tell! this motion was oppoſed. The ground of this oppoſition was, that it was the duty of the Houſe firſt to attend to the diſcharge of their legiſlative functions, before they attended to the *paying of compliments.* It was ſaid, on the other hand, that it had been the practice, ever ſince the eſtabliſhment of the general government, for the Houſe to make a ſhort adjournment, for the purpoſe mentioned in the motion.

After

After ſome converſation in this way, *Mr. Gallatin* moved, that the words "*half an hour*," be ſtruck out.

This amendment was rejected. The motion was then put, and loſt:

Ayes 38
Noes 50

Thus was it determined, by a majority of twelve, to withhold from the Preſident a ſlight compliment, which he had been accuſtomed to receive from the Houſe, from the firſt year of its exiſtence.

I was but too right in ſaying, that, at the opening of the ſeſſion, "he ſaw, even among thoſe to whom "he addreſſed himſelf, numbers, who were ready "to preſent him the cup of humiliation filled to the "brim."

The excuſe, "that it was the duty of the Houſe "firſt to attend to the diſcharge of their legiſlative "functions," was a moſt miſerable ſubterfuge. *Half an hour* only was aſked for. Heavens! how many half hours have been idled away this very ſeſſion!—The Speaker ſends word that he is *indiſpoſed*.—Adjourn! Adjourn!—And this is repeated *day after day*. What would have been eaſier than to appoint a Speaker *pro tem.* if members were ſo remiſs in the "diſcharge of their legiſlative functions?" Yet this was not done, nor, I believe, propoſed; though ſome one of theſe fifty indefatigable members was certainly preſent. How differently do men ſee the ſame object, under different circumſtances! The Speaker's headach adjourns the Houſe for whole days. But *half an hour*, a poor thirty minutes, was too precious to be waſted in a reſpectful compliment to the Preſident!

The Gentleman from *Whiſkyland* was, without doubt, afraid that the motion would not be rejected altogether. He imagined the Houſe had not ſo far got the better of *prejudice*, as to come to an unqualified

qualified determination not to wait on the Prefident; he therefore propofed to leave out the words, "*half an hour*." If this amendment had paffed, the Houfe would have adjourned, not for *half an hour*, but for the whole day; but then it would have feemed that they did it for their own pleafure and recreation, and not for the purpofe of complimenting General Waſhington, the only thing that Mr. Gallatin ſeems to have been afraid of.

This propoſed amendment is an excellent explanation of the ambiguous excuſe, "that it was the "duty of the Houſe firſt to attend to the diſcharge "of their legiſlative functions." What! would their duty permit them to ſeparate for *the whole day*, and not permit them to ſeparate for *half an hour?* Theſe gentlemen ſeem to count time as the French do their aſſignats; a thirtieth part is more valuable than the whole. Mr. Gallatin appears to have ſcorned the ſubterfuge. No matter how much time was ſpent, or in what manner, ſo that it was not for the expreſs purpoſe of waiting on the Prefident; ſo that the inſult was rendered acute.

What muſt have been the Prefident's reflections, when he read the ſketch of this debate?

When I compare the determinaiion of the Houſe of Repreſentatives of this day, with their conduct and that of the people at the time of the Prefident's inſtallation, I bluſh for them both. His journey from his ſeat in Virginia to New-York was almoſt one continued triumphal entry. As he approached the towns, he found the road decked with laurel and ſtrewed with flowers. Sometimes he was hailed with the firing of cannon, at others with the ringing of bells, and every where with the ſhouts of the multitude. Proceſſions were formed to conduct him—the magiſtrates, the military, men of all trades, companies of matrons, and choirs of white-robed virgins. It were vain to attempt an account of the feſtivals

feſtivals, balls, galas, fireworks, illuminations, mottos, ſonnets, and odes, in honour of the "Saviour "of his Country." "Merit" (ſaid one of his panegyriſts on this occaſion), "merit muſt be great "indeed, when it can call forth ſuch honours from "a free and enlightened people: honours due to "a man, whoſe life has been one ſeries of labours, "which are upon a ſcale that Heaven never before "aſſigned to mortal. *Future generations* will ſay of "him with the poet:

"So near perfection, that he ſtood
"Upon the bound'ry line
"Of finite from *infinite good*,
"Of human from *divine*."

Will "future generations" believe, that in leſs than ſeven years after this unbounded ſtrain of panegyric was in vogue, the Repreſentatives of the People came to a formal determination, that *half an hour* was too much to be waſted in congratulating this ſame man on the return of his birthday?

Debate on the Bill authorizing a Loan for the Uſe of the City of Waſhington.

February 23*d.*

This debate was very long, and rather unintereſting; but, as I mean to ſpeak on it myſelf, I cannot with candour refuſe to give a ſketch of what was ſaid by one or two of my opponents, to enable the reader to judge between us.

Mr. SWANWICK (who ſpoke on the ſame ſide that I ſhall do) ſaid, that he objected to the bill generally upon the ſame ground as yeſterday, with reſpect to joining the ſecurities of the lots and the faith of the United States together. He aſked, how the paſſing of this bill could give value to the buildings of the Federal city? Is it not, ſaid he, already enacted, that Congreſs ſhall ſit there in the year 1801? The value of the lots, he ſaid, was to be increaſed only

by the ſelling them to a number of perſons. The city muſt owe its proſperity to its peculiar advantages as a commercial ſpot, and not to its being the ſeat of government. It was therefore the intereſt of the United States to ſell the lots, and induce the people to ſettle there. The higher price the lots bore, the greater would be the obſtacles to ſettlement. If it was the intention of the United States to grant money for the completion of the buildings, let the Houſe ſay ſo. When it was firſt propoſed to remove the Government to the Federal city, it was ſaid, that it would be the intereſt of perſons to give lots to encourage the Government to come there. The ſecurity now aſked for was never contemplated. He had, however, no objection to the United States granting money, but he was againſt the making of two loans, one on the credit of the United States, and another on that of the United States and certain lots.

Mr. BRENT (from *Virginia)* ſaid, that it had been obſerved, that if the lots be a ſufficient ſurety for the loan, why guarantee it? At preſent, he ſaid, the lots were not ſufficient. Mr. Brent obſerved, *that the bill before them would be conſidered as the touchſtone to determine whether the ſeat of government will go to the banks of the Potomack, or not.* Motives of policy and economy, and objections to increaſing the public debt, will not apply in this caſe; the very act provides funds to guarantee the loan; for though the property, until the propoſed loan be guaranteed, would ſell for *a mere trifle,* when it is *guaranteed,* it will ſell for a *great price*; ſo great a difference would it make, that he believed property which will then ſell for two millions of dollars, would not otherwiſe be worth 100,000 dollars. If, therefore, Gentlemen are againſt the bill from economical views, they are miſtaken; for it was his opinion, that the property would not only pay off the loan, but eventually *be a conſiderable fund towards the diſcharge of the public debt.*

It

It had been ſuggeſted, that the United States were under no obligation to make this guarantee. He thought differently; he believed the credit of the United States materially concerned. The public have relied fully upon the countenance of Government in the buſineſs; many perſons indeed have made great ſacrifices to procure lots in this new city, and if, after holding out temptations to people, Government ſhould not go there at the propoſed time, all theſe perſons will be ruined, and a *ſtain will be laid on the national character*. He hoped, therefore, no objection would be made to carrying the bill into effect.

Mr. GILES (from *Virginia)* wiſhed to remark on what had fallen from a Member from Pennſylvania yeſterday, with reſpect to the law providing for the removal of the ſeat of government. *That law, he ſaid, differed from all others.* The conſtitution itſelf, he ſaid, preſcribes the rule: the act only fixes the ſpot where it ſhould be carried into effect. *The act is, therefore, not repealable.* The conſtitution does not give a power to fix upon two ſpots, but upon one ſpot. He thought it neceſſary to make this remark, leſt he might be ſuppoſed to countenance the opinion he combatted. It had been remarked, that it would be in ſome degree degrading to the United States, to borrow money on the credit of lots; he thought differently, and ſhowed that it was a common thing in governments to borrow money on different funds. It had been wiſhed to diſconnect the Government from the buſineſs: whilſt Government guaranteed the loan, he ſaid it would make no difference whether the loan was bottomed on the lots, or otherwiſe. The nature of the engagement was the ſame. The queſtion was, whether the Houſe would agree to guarantee the loan, or not.

Mr. GILES ſaid, that he had ſeen and was acquainted with the buildings carrying on in the Federal

ral city. He thought *the houſe erecting for the reſidence of the Preſident was much too magnificent*, much more ſo than was intended. Every one thought ſo who ſaw it; but this was no reaſon for obſtructing the progreſs of the buſineſs. He hoped the bill would be formed in a manner ſo as to meet the general ſenſe of the Houſe. Though he had *objected to the grandeur of the houſe intended for the Preſident*, he would have the buildings *for Congreſs erected on a grand ſcale, and fitted for the Repreſentatives of a great and free people.*

The bill was finally recommitted.

Remarks.—The reader has heard what was ſaid on both ſides of this queſtion, and I have now to beg him to attend to what I would have ſaid, had I been a Member of Congreſs.

Mr. Chairman,

It is well known that I am no orator; that I ſpeak right on, making my tongue the true interpreter of my heart. You will not therefore expect from me the wily ſophiſtry of a G—tin, the quibbling of a G—les, the verboſity of a B—win, or the patriotic bombaſt of a Liv—ton.

It is ſeldom, Sir, that I trouble the Houſe with my ſentiments on any queſtion whatever. There are ſo many Gentlemen among us, who are ſpeechifiers by profeſſion, who deck every ſubject, however ſteril and trifling, with all the flowers of the garden of eloquence, that a plain ſpokeſman like me can have little chance of being heard with any degree of patience. On the preſent occaſion, however, theſe Gentlemen do not ſeem to become like the bee, loaded with ſweets; the few they have brought with them are already ſcattered abroad, and have loſt their fragrance: and as the day is not yet far enough advanced to countenance an adjournment, permit me to hope for indulgence, while I humbly endeavour to ſpin out the time between this and dinner; or as our plough-

men have it, while I take a gentle turn to wind down the fun.

Should Gentlemen find themfelves inclined to repofe, as I have often been in liftening to them, I beg them not to ftand upon ceremony, but to loll back at their eafe, and leave me to jog quietly on.

We are called upon, Sir, to *guarantee* a loan, for which the lots of the city of Waſhington are to be a *fecurity*; and the Gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Brent, tells us, that though the lots are at preſent worth but a *mere trifle*, they will, when guaranteed, be of *great value*. This is rather obſcure; I ſhall therefore endeavour to explain it by compariſon, which, I make no doubt, I ſhall do to the ſatisfaction of the Houſe. Suppoſe I had a lot not worth a braſs farthing, and was to draw a note payable out of the produce of this ſame lot, ſuch note would be worth but a "*mere* "*trifle*;" but, when endorſed by a man of credit, it would be "*of great value*;" becauſe the holder would always know where to look for payment.

But the friends of the guarantee do not ſtop here. They aſſure us that it would render the lots ſo very valuable as to "create a conſiderable fund towards "the diſcharge of the public debt!" Much as I wiſh to ſee that debt diſcharged, I by no means approve of its being done by taking advantage of an overſtrained generoſity. The Virginians have moſt generouſly beſtowed part of the land; and not content with that, they now offer us an opportunity of paying off the public debt with ſpeculations in the lots. I am one of thoſe who are willing to forego any and every offer of this kind. I am willing that the Virginians themſelves ſhould be permitted to guarantee this loan, and receive excluſively all the immenſe advantages accruing therefrom. Let them undertake the negotiation upon their own bottom, which, from the great credit they enjoy in foreign countries,

countries, they cannot fail to effect upon the moſt reaſonable terms.

It is ſaid, that foreigners will not venture their money on the lots, becauſe they can form no idea of their value; neither can I: and this is another reaſon for my wiſhing to leave the buſineſs in the hands of thoſe who are upon the ſpot, and who ſeem to be the only perſons intereſted in the matter.

The Gentleman who made us the bounteous propoſal for paying off the public debt by the means of the guarantee, concluded with an argument, which, I believe, he conceived to carry more weight with it; that is, unleſs the Government went to the city of Waſhington at the time ſpecified by the act, it would be "*a ſtain on the national character.*" I participate with Mr. Brent in his anxiety for our national character, and am glad to have it in my power to convince him, that it could be in no danger from the diſappointment he ſeems ſo much afraid of. We ſee a very conſiderable State of the Union, Sir, tenaciouſly adhering to a law, made expreſsly to ſkreen its citizens from the obligation of diſcharging their juſt debts; and we have ſeen this very Houſe paſs a reſolution for the ſequeſtration of all debts due from Americans to their creditors in Great Britain. Neither of theſe has ever been called a ſtain on our national character; and if theſe are not, if our character is proof againſt theſe, I imagine we have little to fear from the Government's remaining at Philadelphia. I will mention another inſtance, Sir, ſtill ſtronger. If we look back into the journals of Congreſs, we ſhall find the King of France ſtyled, our *great* and *good ally*, our *friend* and *deliverer*; and yet we have applauded his murd . . . . . [Here the Chairman would have called me to order; upon which I ſhould have ſaid]—Sir, I ſhould be ſorry to break through the rules of this Houſe, and I muſt inſiſt that I am perfectly in order. The Gen-

tleman from Virginia had laid great ſtreſs on what he preſumed would be a ſtain on our national character. I looked upon myſelf as entitled to prove that he was miſtaken; and I certainly had a right to do this, by bringing forward what I conceived to be much better calculated to impreſs a ſtain, and which, however, had not produced that effect. If, therefore, there was any deviation from the queſtion, the Gentleman led the way, and I was only following him. Beſides, Sir, look over the debates of this Houſe, and you will ſee to what a nutſhell compaſs they will be reduced, if you exclude all the extraneous matter. If members are to be bound down to the ſimple queſtion before them, if no latitude of digreſſion is allowed of, no little rambles to France for eulogium, and to Great Britain for invective, how do you imagine, Sir, that *patriotic* members would be able to give proofs of their diligence, by eking out the ſeſſion to ſix or ſeven months? Your aſſent, Sir, to the juſtneſs of theſe obſervations encourages me to take up the thread of my argument.

If, on the day of our pompous reception of the French flag, poor murdered Louis had riſen up through the floor, and ſaid, "Ungrateful Ame-"ricans! you who flattered me in the hour of "my proſperity and your diſtreſs; you who called "me your deliverer; you who made public rejoi-"cings for the day of my nativity, are now joining "hands with the very men who led me to the block; "are expreſſing 'your ſincere and lively ſenſibility, "your ſympathy and affection' towards them; are "giving a pompous reception to the emblems of "their triumph over me, at the very moment that "my portrait, which was to be the momento of my "ſervices and of your gratitude, is hanging up "within your walls"—If the ſpectre of this injured Prince had thus ſpoken, what ſhould we have ſaid?

I know

I know a Member who would have replied, Avaunt, "ermined monſter!" But, for my part, I ſhould have felt the ſtain: I ſhould have thought myſelf ſpotted as a leopard; and yet, Sir, this has never been mentioned as a ſtain on our national character. To apprehend, therefore, any danger from our not removing to the banks of the Potomack, is to ſtrain at a gnat, while we ſwallow a giant.

Much has been ſaid, Sir, on the manner in which the buildings of the city of Waſhington have been conducted. This is a branch of the ſubject that I ſhould have paſſed over in ſilence, had it not been for an expreſſion or two that fell from another Gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Giles. That Gentleman obſerved that "the houſe erecting for the reſidence "of the Preſident, was *much too magnificent*;" but "that though he *objected to the grandeur* of the houſe "intended for *the Preſident*, he would have the "buildings *for Congreſs* erected upon a *grand ſcale*, "and fitted for the *Repreſentatives of a great* and *free* "*people*."—I do not chooſe, Sir, to let this ſally go abroad unnoticed, leſt the world ſhould imagine us all tainted with that ungovernable vanity, which ſeems to have engroſſed the ſoul of our unfortunate colleague.

The Gentleman is afraid that the houſe of the Preſident may be *too magnificent*; but that which he expects to occupy *himſelf*, he wiſhes to ſee upon a *grand ſcale*. Modeſt man! The Preſident is to be kept within the walls of a plain building, to remind him of the lowlineſs of his eſtate, of his being the *ſervant* of the public; while Mr. Giles is to ſtrut beneath the roof of buildings upon a *grand ſcale*, fitted for the *Repreſentatives* of a *great people*; or, in other words, for the *great Repreſentatives* of the people.

I am thinking, Sir, that the public will do well to keep *us* within a plain building, or I am afraid our

heads will ſoon be turned. We are in abſolute need of being dieted, for we are graſping not only at all honour, but at all power too. If we once enter the pile propoſed by our colleague; if we once get under thoſe Corinthian columns and ſtarry vaults, we ſhall expect other things on a "*grand ſcale*" alſo; we muſt have our coaches and ſix, our led horſes, our pages, our grooms, our huntſmen and our buck-hounds; our villas, baths, ſofas, and beds of ſtate. We may expect, in due time, to hear the Gentleman from Virginia propoſe a *ſeraglio* as among the conveniencies of the "*Repreſentatives* of a *great* and *free* "people."

Much do I fear, Sir, that if we were once got in poſſeſſion of all theſe pretty things, we ſhould be very loath to return to our humble dwellings and our homely fare. In ſhort, I think we ſhould do like the *great Repreſentatives* of the French, that is, declare ourſelves permanent, or, at leaſt, order the people to elect nobody but ourſelves, which amounts to exactly the ſame.

But we are told that this building upon a *grand ſcale* is not intended as an honour to us, but to our conſtituents. This is the very gull-trap which the poor ſilly French have fallen into. Every thing that their grovelling, low-bred tyrants have aſſumed to themſelves, has been done under the ſpecious pretext of doing honour "to a *great* and *free* people." They have ſeized on all the palaces in the kingdom, on the royal ſtuds, coaches, and every other article of luxury, for their own excluſive uſe; they wallow in ſumptuouſneſs, while their ragged ſlaves have but two or three ounces of dirty-coloured bread a day, and if they murmur, they ſhoot them down by thouſands; and all this is for the "honour of a *great* and "*free* people." A great people, a free people, a ſovereign people, and the like, are very pretty phraſes; they tickle the ears of the multitude; but ſhould they

they perceive how completely the demagogues tranſfer this grandeur, liberty, and ſovereignty to themſelves, perhaps they would ceaſe to admire them; and nothing ſeems better calculated to open their eyes, than ſeeing them in a ſplendid palace, while they, many of them at leaſt, are obliged to put up with log-huts.

It is become a prevailing faſhion among the oppoſers of our Government, to confine the expreſſion "Repreſentatives of the People" to this Houſe only. But, Sir, is not this a very falſe, as well as dangerous notion? Is not the Preſident the Repreſentative of the people as well as Mr. Giles?—Yes, and of the whole of the people too, while Mr. Giles repreſents but a very ſmall part of one State. The epithet *immediate* is ſometimes prefixed; but then Mr. Giles can be the *immediate Repreſentative* of no more than an eighteenth part of the State of Virginia, while the Preſident is the immediate Repreſentative of the whole Union; for the repreſentation muſt ever be immediate, though the election may not. If, therefore, a preference is due to any branch of the Government, the Preſident ſeems to have a better title to it than any of us: and ſeeing the thing in this light, I cannot help looking upon the obſervation of the Gentleman from Virginia as extremely improper, if not indecent.

I thought, Sir, I heard the word *Capitol* mentioned during the debate. For the love of modeſty, I hope the Congreſs-houſe is not to be called a *Capitol!* If this be the caſe, it will be neceſſary to go a ſtep further, and aſſume the maſquerade dreſs of the French Romans. How pretty we ſhall look in long white robes, deſcending to our toes, a blue girdle about our waiſts, a ſcarlet cloak on our ſhoulders, and a red liberty cap on our heads! Let them all be well embroidered with gold, as thoſe of the French legiſlators *are to be*; and if they are even ſet with precious ſtones, it will be an additional proof of our

jealouſy for the honour of "a *great* and *free people*." We ſhall, indeed, bring upon us a ridicule equal to that excited by the upſtart pettifoggers of the National Aſſembly, when they inſiſted on the folding-doors of the Louvre being thrown open at their approach: but let the world be merry; while we are ſwaggering about in our conſular robes, we ſhall care but little whether we are called ambitious buffoons or not.

The idea of a *Capitol* ſeems to be borrowed from the State of Virginia, the Aſſembly-houſe of which has taken that name. For what reaſon it was there adopted I know not, unleſs it be that there are ſuch numbers of Cæſars and Pompeys in the neighbourhood, againſt whoſe ambitious projects the grave and virtuous Senate are ever vigilant to preſerve the liberty of their country. The *Capitol* of Virginia reſembles that of Rome alſo, in that it has a *ſlave-mart* in its vicinity.

I ſhall now, Sir, return to the propoſed guarantee, and advert to another of the forcible arguments of Mr. Brent. This gentleman tells us, that "the "guarantee is the touchſtone to prove whether the "ſeat of government is to be removed or not." I am willing to take the gentleman at his word. I am willing to allow, that refuſing the guarantee of the loan, will amount to a declaration of our wiſh to remain where we are: and, with this view, I ſhall give the refuſal my hearty ſupport . . . . [Here a loud cry of Hear him! Hear him!] I am glad to find, Mr. Chairman, that Gentlemen are ſo diſpoſed to hear; for I can aſſure them that what I have to ſay, is not only worth hearing, but attending to alſo.

I look forward, Sir, to the day of removing the Government to the banks of the Potomack, as the dawn of its deſtruction. Open the page of hiſtory, and you will ſee that the fate of every popular government in a great meaſure depends on the diſpoſition of the people immediately in its neighbourhood.

hood. I could cite you a thouſand examples from the fall of the Grecian States down to our own times, but I ſhall content myſelf with one of modern date; and as the Gentlemen on the other ſide of the Houſe are ſo fond of flying to France, I truſt I ſhall be excuſed for doing the ſame.

When the Conſtituent Aſſembly conceived the deſtructive project of annihilating the government, which their conſtituents had poſitively ordered them to aid and ſtrengthen, what did they do? Removed themſelves to Paris, where they knew the greateſt number of diſaffected perſons were aſſembled. The conſequences are but too well known.

We are not ignorant of the general diſpoſition of the State to which this Government is to be removed. We have ſeen its Legiſlature, during this very ſeſſion, ſoliciting every State in the Union to join them in reducing this government to a mere democracy. Nor can any of us have forgotten the public invitation to the people of other States, to oppoſe the treaty with his Britannic Majeſty by open force, boaſting that there were "a hundred thouſand free and independent Virginians," ready to ſtrike the firſt blow. Can it be ſuppoſed then, if we were now aſſembled at the city of Waſhington, that theſe hundred thouſand free and independent Virginians, whether black, white, or yellow, would not dictate to us all we ſhould dare to ſay or do? Do you think, Sir, that the cutting truths which have this day fallen from my lips, would ever have been uttered in the city of Waſhington? No; I ſhould have expected to have my throat cut, or my eyes gouged out by ſome ſlave or ſlave-dealer, before I got home to my dinner. I will never go there, Sir! and to thoſe Gentlemen who do, I ſincerely recommend the precaution of a ſteel collar, if not a ſuit of armour *cap-à-pé*.

Mr. GILES has told us, Sir, that the law for the removal

removal of the ſeat of government differs from all others; that "the Conſtitution itſelf has marked the "*rule*, and only left Congreſs to name the ſpot; that "the law is therefore not *repealable*." Curious quibble! The Conſtitution ſays, that the Congreſs ſhall "exerciſe excluſive legiſlation over ſuch diſtrict "as may become the ſeat of government of the "United States." Now, what is there here that makes the act unrepealable? What *rule* is here marked out? Is there a word about the law being unalterable? Does the Conſtitution ſay, that when the diſtrict is once fixed on, it ſhall never be changed for another? There is ſomething ſo ridiculous in the idea, that one would wonder how it ever found its way into words; and to hazard thoſe words, the Gentleman muſt have a very high opinion of the forbearance of this Houſe. Suppoſe, for inſtance, the banks of the Potomack ſhould be viſited with the plague or yellow fever; are we to remain there, and let our carcaſſes be thrown into the river? Suppoſe a volcano or earthquake, or, in ſhort, ſuppoſe what you will, are we yet bound to make the city of Waſhington the ſeat of government? And what, I aſk, are plagues, yellow fevers, volcanos, and earthquakes, compared with the knives of "a hun"dred thouſand *free* and *independent ſlaves?*" In a word, Mr. Chairman, ſo fully am I convinced, that the removal of the ſeat of government to the neighbourhood of the State of Virginia will prove the overthrow of our happy Conſtitution, and eventually plunge our country in anarchy and blood, that I ſhall not only oppoſe every meaſure that may accelerate the fatal epoch, but I pledge myſelf to bring forward a motion for the repeal of the act altogether.—And now, Sir, as I ſee the Gentlemen from Virginia are burſting with reply, I ſit down, ſatisfied of having diſcharged my duty, without giving offence to any one to whoſe ears truth is not diſagreeable.

Debate

Debate on the Meaſures to be taken to prevent the Impreſſment of American Seamen.

February 18*th.*

Mr. LIVINGSTON *(New-York)* ſaid, he would call the attention of the Houſe to the ſituation of a very important and meritorious claſs of men, whoſe value ſeemed to have been overlooked, and whoſe deareſt rights were either ſhamefully neglected or ignominiouſly ſurrendered. He adverted to the ſeamen of the United States. This valuable claſs of men would fall under one of theſe deſcriptions:

1. Native American citizens.

2. Such as were citizens at the declaration of Independence, and at the period of the peace with Great Britain.

3. Foreigners naturalized ſince the declaration of Independence.

It would be no difficult matter to prove, that all the individuals of either of thoſe deſcriptions were equally entitled to the protection of Government; to the ſame or greater exertions in *their* favour than were made for thoſe citizens whoſe ſituation rendered it eaſier to apply for relief. Yet this meritorious body of our conſtituents, he ſaid, thus entitled to our protection and favour, ſailing under the ſanction of our national flag, had been illegally ſeized, violently forced into a ſervice they abhorred, cruelly torn from their relations, their families, and their country, and ignominiouſly ſcourged for aſſerting the privileges of their citizenſhip. The country, to which they looked for protection and relief, had regarded their ſufferings with apathy and indifference! Three years we had beheld their miſeries and heard their cries; yet for three years we had been ſilent ſpectators of this diſgraceful ſcene. We had begun a compact with their oppreſſors, in which theſe unfortunate men looked in vain for one word of comfort in their miſery,

fery, for one little article in the voluminous pages of the inſtrument, that might offer a hope of recompenſe for their paſt ſufferings, or ſecurity againſt future oppreſſions. "*I bluſh* (ſaid Mr. Livingſton) as "an American, to think it was an American Miniſter "who could be *guilty* of this *diſgraceful omiſſion*. I "ſhould be *covered with ſhame* and confuſion *for my* "country, if I could ſuppoſe it capable of giving "that omiſſion its ſanction; and I hold it a ſacred "duty, in whatever ſtation I may be placed, to "contribute every exertion, and the little influence "I poſſeſs, for their relief."—He concluded with moving the following reſolution:

Reſolved, That a Committee be appointed to inquire and report whether any, and what legiſlative proviſion is neceſſary for the relief of ſuch American ſeamen as may have been impreſſed into the ſervice of any foreign power—and alſo to report a mode of furniſhing American ſeamen with ſuch evidence of their citizenſhip as may protect them from foreign impreſſments in future.

Referred to a ſelect Committee.

February 29th.

The Committee made their report, the ſubſtance of which was, that the impreſſment of American ſeamen by *foreign powers* was too *notorious* to *need proof*; and that the Preſident of the United States ſhall ſend agents to *England* and the Weſt Indies, in order to afford relief to ſuch American *citizens* as have been illegally ſeized.

Mr. HARPER *(S. Carolina)* hoped when this reſolution was committed to a ſelect Committee, ſome ſtatements would have been brought forward, ſome facts produced, upon which to found the propoſed inquiry. The Committee have reported that they do not think it neceſſary to adduce any particular inſtances in which American ſeamen have been im-

preſſed by foreign nations: the facts, they alleged, are too notorious to require particularizing. He could not ſuppoſe theſe Gentlemen would believe that the Houſe could proceed to legiſlate on uncertain newſpaper reports. He truſted they would afford ſome proof, who, what number, when, and where American ſeamen have been impreſſed. Until this was done, he ſhould doubt the fact. He was heard, he believed, by Repreſentatives from every port in the United States; and if the fact was ſo notorious as to need no further evidence, he doubted not ſome of theſe Gentlemen would be able to give ſome account of the buſineſs.

If the facts were eſtabliſhed, Mr. Harper believed there would be but one opinion on the propriety of granting relief; but before they proceeded farther, ſome information was neceſſary reſpecting the exiſtence of this abuſe. He had applied to the office of the Secretary of State, and to other offices likely to afford information on the ſubject; but he found no inſtance of the impreſſment complained of, in which redreſs had not been given. But if any ſuch inſtances do exiſt, in which relief has been applied for and not obtained, Gentlemen from ſome of the ſeaports will be able to mention them. If not, he hoped the Committee would riſe and recommit the report.

Mr. LIVINGSTON ſaid, the preſent meaſure was intended to afford relief to ſuch of their diſtreſſed fellow-citizens as had been illegally ſeized on the high ſeas. The Gentleman, he ſaid, who brings forward objections to the propoſed inquiry, was in his place when the reſolution upon which the report of the Committee is founded, paſſed unanimouſly. Why did he not then come forward? [Mr. Harper ſaid he was not in the Houſe at the time.]—The reſolution does not direct the Committee to inquire into facts; they were conſidered as notorious; and nothing ſeemed neceſſary but to fix upon the beſt mode of furniſhing

furniſhing relief. The Legiſlature of the United States have formerly had evidence, and they have acted upon it. If the Gentleman will look into the proceedings of the laſt ſeſſion of Congreſs, he will find a conſiderable ſum granted to Mr. Cutting, for relief of this diſtreſſed body of men. Some he relieved, others he did not. When the dignity of the nation, ſaid he, is inſulted in the perſons of our fellow-citizens, it is neceſſary at leaſt to make inquiry into their ſufferings.

A remark had fallen, Mr. Livingſton ſaid, from the Member from South Carolina, which he wiſhed to notice. He ſaid he had applied to the office of the Secretary of State, and found there no complaint which had not been redreſſed. Now, he had waited upon the Secretary of State, as Chairman of the Committee, in vain, for information on the ſubject. The Secretary informed him, that he could not give him the evidence, which it appears he has given to the Member from South Carolina. How, he wiſhed to know, happened it, that a Member who oppoſes the buſineſs in queſtion, ſhould be furniſhed with that information which was denied to a Member who ſupported it?

It is ſaid, added Mr. Livingſton, that we are attempting to legiſlate without evidence. Though no facts are at preſent before the Houſe, it is notorious that numerous inſtances have been made known to Government, and the preſent meaſure is meant to inquire into the caſes of ſufferers, and remedy them as far as poſſible. It is admitted by the Member from South Carolina that facts have exiſted, but that they have been removed. If theſe grievances then, ſaid he, have exiſted, let us prevent them in future. Let us not wait till it is too late to grant relief. The men, ſaid he, who ſuffer by the depredations complained of, are at a great diſtance from their homes and friends, in foreign ports, dragged on board ten-

 ders,

ders, and made to experience every hardſhip that can be conceived. And now, when a mode is propoſed for the relief of theſe diſtreſſed citizens, evidence is called for! *If one of theſe men is confined in the Eaſt Indies, can evidence of his bondage be expected to be given here?* Such hardſhips have exiſted, and it was their buſineſs *to prevent them from again occurring.* He hoped, therefore, the Committee would not riſe, as he truſted there was ſufficient evidence on which to ground the inquiry.

Mr. HARPER wiſhed to remark on what had fallen from the Member from New-York, on the Secretary of State's refuſing information to certain members and giving it to others. He applied to the office of the Secretary of State, to learn whether there were any documents there to ſupport the propoſed inquiry, and was informed there were only two caſes; in one of which application was made to the Britiſh Government: *four perſons* were ſaid to have been impreſſed; but on inquiry, it appeared, *that two of them were Britiſh ſubjects, and the other two had inliſted into the ſervice.* The other complaint came to the office when the Secretary of State was much engaged in other concerns, but he believed relief was granted. This, he ſaid, was verbal information; he had applied for written documents on the ſubject, and doubted not he ſhould receive them as ſoon as other buſineſs would permit.

Mr. SWANWICK *(Pennſylvania)* ſaid, the Member from S. Carolina had called for information; he conceived no particular information neceſſary. He could mention an inſtance in which he had immediate concern. A veſſel of his going to the Weſt Indies had all her hands taken out of her, and obliged to work the guns of an Engliſh frigate; and, on their expoſtulating, that though they were priſoners they did not wiſh to work the guns, they were threatened with whipping, and the Captain

was

was told, if he interfered, he ſhould be whipped and *ſent home* to England in irons. If he had thought facts were wanting, by a ſingle advertiſement in one of the Philadelphia papers, they would have been overpowered with facts. But if he had done ſo, he ſuppoſed he ſhould have been charged with raiſing diſſatisfaction in the minds of the people, or with encouraging Jacobinical principles. He therefore did not do it. But, without going out of the walls of the Houſe, he ſaid, he found evidence ſufficient. He read an extract from the communication of the Secretary of State, dated March 2, 1794, in which were mentioned the repreſentations made by ſundry merchants of Philadelphia (of whom he was one) reſpecting the impreſſment of American ſeamen. This document was thought ſufficiently ſtrong to make an article of inſtruction to Mr. Jay in his late negotiation; but, owing to certain difficulties, no ſpecific agreement was entered into by him for their relief.

The plan now before the Houſe, ſaid Mr. Swanwick, is intended to remedy the difficulties which have been urged as obſtacles in this buſineſs, by opening regiſters in which to enter every American ſeaman, by which may be known at any time the number of ſeamen belonging to the United States, and by means of which every ſuch ſeaman would be poſſeſſed of a certificate of his *citizenſhip*.

Every one knows, ſaid he, what has *been felt* on account of American ſeamen carried into *Algiers*. *No evidence was required with reſpect to their numbers, or how they were employed.* The united exertions of the whole American people *ſeemed to cry out* for their releaſement, and the buſineſs, at length, has been effected. And let us not, ſaid he, attend to our diſtreſſed citizens, in one part only, but in all parts of the world. Let us not, ſaid he, *be too nice about evidence*. Theſe men are generally *ignorant*, and cannot

cannot give the neceſſary information; he thought, however, they had information ſufficient for legiſlating upon in the preſent caſe. He hoped, therefore, the report would not be recommitted, until the Committee had diſcuſſed the buſineſs.

Mr. TRACY (from *Connecticut*) believed that every Member in that Houſe felt the propriety of extending the benefit of the laws to every claſs of citizens, and to none more than to American ſeamen. Some members ſeemed to ſuppoſe that the diſtreſſes of American ſeamen have been looked upon with apathy; but if due attention had been paid to the efforts of Government, it would have been ſeen that they had always been duly attended to. It is well known that great difficulties ariſe when it is attempted to diſtinguiſh between *Engliſh and American ſeamen*. This has been the reaſon why ample regulations have not always taken place. He hoped the Government would be popular, and that the new members in the Houſe would aſſiſt the old ones to render it more and more ſo; but thought Government ought not to be charged with apathy without paying due attention to what Government had done.

Mr. Tracy proceeded to take notice of the reſolutions propoſed in the report. He inquired what good the agent to be ſent to Great Britain would do. Are there ſeamen, ſaid he, employed but at one place? Had not the United States conſuls at every port, and can they not do the buſineſs? He wiſhed for information on the ſubject. *A great part of the ſeamen were foreigners*, he ſaid, and it would be very difficult to ſeparate them. If the plan propoſed, however, could be made to appear to be beneficial, he would heartily join in effecting the deſired relief to the claſs of citizens alluded to.

Mr. GOODHUE (from *Maſſachuſetts*) ſaid the Member from New-York, on bringing forward this buſineſs,

ſineſs, had charged Government with looking upon the diſtreſſes of American ſeamen with apathy, and *bluſhed* on account of its conduct towards them. He repreſented, he believed, twenty times the number of American ſeamen that that Gentleman repreſented: he was himſelf, indeed, formerly a ſeaman; yet he did not believe the evil complained of exiſted to any alarming degree. Mr. Cutting, it had been ſaid, had relieved many ſeamen; that was in the year 1790. Laſt ſummer the Britiſh took many veſſels bound to France, but they did not take the crews. There were ſome inſtances, he ſaid, in which ſeamen had been impreſſed, and he ſhould be in favour of every neceſſary ſtep to afford them relief; but no obloquy ſhould be thrown on Government. Neither does the evil exiſt to the extent it might have been ſuppoſed, when the buſineſs was brought forward. A Member from Pennſylvania had mentioned a particular inſtance: he could mention a particular inſtance of a French Captain who had ſo ill-treated ſome American ſeamen as to be caſhiered, on a repreſentation being made to the French Government.

Mr. DAYTON (from *New-Jerſey*) ſaid that he had not expected an oppoſition to the reſolution under conſideration on the ground of fact: that he could not have ſuppoſed any Member would have queſtioned the exiſtence of the evils which the propoſitions were calculated to remedy. He entertained a belief that the impreſſment of American ſeamen, particularly on board of Britiſh ſhips of war, was a matter of too great notoriety to need any evidence at this time. But the Member from South Carolina, who manifeſted the moſt zealous oppoſition to theſe meaſures, had admitted that there had exiſted inſtances of this ſort; and as it muſt follow that what had once exiſted might again exiſt, it behoved Congreſs to make proviſions tending to prevent, or

at

at leaſt moſt ſpeedily and efficaciouſly to remedy them.

Mr. Dayton declared that he heartily approved the object of the reſolution, as originally propoſed by the Member from New-York, and the general principles of the report founded thereon, as a queſtion of humanity, and of great national policy. It was, however, with pain that he heard the worthy mover draw into unfavourable queſtion the conduct of the Secretary of State, and indulge himſelf in ſome ſevere reflections and imputations upon that officer. Mr. Dayton aſcribed it to an irritability, and perhaps an honeſt irritability, upon this ſubject ſo affecting and intereſting to Americans. He aſcribed it to a warmth of temper, in which, in this particular caſe, the cooler judgment of that Gentleman, and the knowledge of the real character and conduct of the Secretary of State, had no agency or influence. The expreſſions which had been uttered by ſome Gentlemen in the courſe of the diſcuſſion, tending to charge our Government with a criminal apathy and indifference towards this deſcription of citizens, did by no means, Mr. Dayton ſaid, meet with his approbation: he believed them to be unfounded; for he was perſuaded that whenever it heard, it did whatever it could to relieve the ſeamen of the United States, and to obtain for thoſe who unfortunately needed it, complete redreſs. Having ſaid thus much in vindication of the conduct of the Government, he returned to the reſolution itſelf, and declared himſelf its advocate. It contained, neither in its words nor ſpirit, any imputation upon the Executive of the ſort hinted at.

In the former caſe every one muſt perceive it more than poſſible, that owing to diſtance and the time which muſt conſequently be expended in the communication to, and remonſtrance from our Government, an *American citizen* might be impreſſed

and compelled to ſerve months, perhaps years, in a ſervice which he deteſted, *and poſſibly forced to apply the match to a cannon charged with balls aimed for the deſtruction of his friends.*

Mr. Bourne (from *Rhode Iſland)* propoſed to amend the reſolution, by ſtriking out that part of it which appoints an agent for Great Britain, and confines the ſending of an agent to that part of the Engliſh poſſeſſions in the Weſt Indies to which the greateſt number of American veſſels ſail.

Mr. Livingston was pleaſed to ſee Gentlemen concur in endeavouring to form a plan for the relief of American ſeamen. It has been aſked why the conſuls were not intruſted with this buſineſs; the Committee conſidered, that as the conſuls of the United States received no other recompenſe for their ſervices than the dignity and conſequence which their office gives them, they would not be likely to pay ſufficient attention to a buſineſs of this kind. They conſidered the immenſe labour of Mr. Cutting to deliver the impreſſed American ſeamen. They ſuppoſed, therefore, if the duty were laid upon the conſuls, a ſalary ſhould be annexed to their office; but, as there is no conſul in the Weſt Indies, a ſpecial agent ſhould be appointed. In order to bring a view of the buſineſs before the Houſe, he would aſk, how relief is to be afforded to a ſeaman who has been impreſſed? Suppoſe he is ſeized in London, he is ſent down to Portſmouth. The agent muſt attend immediately, get certificates, pay fees of office, employ counſel, &c. to releaſe a ſingle ſeaman; a trouble, he believed, no conſul would take. The Committee ſuppoſed that the ſolemnity of commiſſioning an agent eſpecially on the buſineſs, would convince *foreign powers* that they would no longer *ſuffer the Britiſh*, or others, to exerciſe that power over American ſeamen which they themſelves could not exerciſe. It is to be hoped alſo, that,

that, when the Government of Great Britain ſees a ſtep of this ſort taken, it will give up the practice of ſeizing American ſeamen, and let them paſs in quietneſs. If not, the agents employed could tranſmit to this country an account of what ſeamen were ſeized by them, and every particular reſpecting the ſame. This conſideration influenced the Committee, and he truſted it would influence the Houſe.

Mr. S. SMITH (from *Maryland)* ſaid, that as the Member from South Carolina had called upon Gentlemen from ſeaports for evidence, if they were ſilent it would be ſuppoſed that no information could be given on the ſubject under diſcuſſion. He ſuppoſed he ſhould be prevented from giving this information now, becauſe the amendment of the firſt reſolution was under conſideration. [The Houſe called for information.] He ſaid he repreſented a port where the fact of American ſeamen being impreſſed by the Britiſh was *ſo notorious* that every *man* knew it. But how, ſaid he, is this information to be got and tranſmitted to the Secretary of State? No complaint is likely to reach his office, except brought there by merchants. In his *own trade* he had frequent inſtances of this ſort, almoſt in every voyage. He could *not ſay the men impreſſed were always Americans, but they were men ſailing under the authority of the United States.* We have a flag; under that flag men are ſeized, and they have a right to expect, when ſeized, redreſs from Government. There is no *difference* between *Britiſh* and *Algerines*; for, by the former, they are compelled to fight againſt thoſe whom they *wiſh well*, which *is equal to any ſlavery that can be impoſed.* He ſaid, that from one of his ſhips there were two New-England men impreſſed; one of whom being a ſtout, courageous man, wiſhed to have defended himſelf againſt his aſſailants; but tho ſupercargo ſaid, No; this will riſk the cargo of

the owner. This advice he gave, ſuppoſing Government would afford theſe men relief.

If the Member from South Carolina wiſhed for *ſuch information as would be received before a Court of Judicature, it could not be got.* Mr. Smith thought ſufficient attention had not been paid by Government *to merchants and ſeamen.* Mr. Jay, in his communication to Lord Grenville, ſays, an impreſſment of American ſeamen had taken place, who had been forced to fight, &c. If this had not been ſo, it had not been written by Mr. Jay, nor would Lord Grenville have promiſed relief. He hoped this information would be thought ſufficient.

It had been ſaid that there were not many inſtances of American ſeamen impreſſed; but, ſuppoſe there were but one man, *and he a negro*, ſuffering under *the galling yoke of impreſſment*, it is the duty of Government to provide relief for that man. The ſame Member has ſaid that the Quiberon veſſels did not impreſs the crews of the ſhips; he ſaid it was ſufficient to take their flour and pay them nine dollars for what might have been ſold the next day for twenty or upwards. Mr. Smith concluded by obſerving, that if we were a feeble nation, we had a right to expect juſtice; but he hoped we were not ſo feeble as ſome Gentlemen imagined.

Mr. GILES (from *Virginia)* was of opinion, with the Member from Rhode Iſland, that American citizens ſhould be attended to in other countries, as well as in Great Britain. He had not heard of any *impreſſments* but by the Britiſh, but he had heard of *captivities*; and that Houſe had heard of a French officer being caſhiered for ill-treating American citizens; but it had heard no inſtance of Great Britain puniſhing officers for ill-treating American citizens. No: this marked the different characters of the two nations towards the Americans.

Mr.

Mr. SWANWICK roſe to inform the Houſe, that ſince he was in his place yeſterday, he had been called upon with evidence on the ſubject now before the Committee, in conſequence of the call made for it in the courſe of the debate. The inſtances he had given to him were, the caſe of Robert Norris, a native of Princeton in New-Jerſey, and *five others* who ſailed on board the American brig Matilda, Captain Burke, from Philadelphia, which ſailed from this port in May laſt for Bourdeaux, and were on the 9th of July brought to by four Britiſh frigates, forcibly taken into the veſſel, impreſſed, and compelled to go and ſerve on board one of the ſaid frigates called the Stag, where they ſerved four months, when the ſaid Robert Norris made his eſcape from the frigate at Sheerneſs, at the riſk of his life, and returned in January laſt to the United States. His companions, he believes, are yet in bondage. The other inſtance was the brig Sally, Captain Wilkins, which ſailed from this port in May laſt bound to Madeira, and five days after leaving the Capes was brought to by the Rattleſnake ſloop of war, Captain York, and the mate *(a native of Scotland,* but who had ſailed for *many years* out of the United States) and one of the beſt ſeamen (an American) taken out. They were carried to Halliſax, from whence the foremaſt-man made his eſcape, and arrived here the beginning of July. Before they arrived at Halliſax, he informs, that fifteen men were taken out of American veſſels. Mr. Swanwick read alſo an account from an owner of ſeveral other impreſſments.

Mr. SEDGWICK (from *Maſſachuſetts)* ſaid, he was yeſterday prevented from attending the Houſe by indiſpoſition. The ſubject ſtruck his mind, he ſaid, in ſeveral points of view which had not been noticed. He was ſurpriſed why the buſineſs was undertaken in the way it was. No deſcription of men, he ſaid,

were more entitled to regard than ſeamen: but this did not reconcile the adoption of the ſubject in the manner propoſed. The Executive, he was of opinion, would conſider itſelf as charged with this buſineſs. An agent, who is neither conſul nor miniſter, is an inſtrument unknown, an undefined character that would not be recogniſed. It was impoſſible, he ſaid, for any two agents, one in Great Britain and the other in the Weſt Indies, to gain information of the ſufferings of ſeamen in different parts of the two countries, particularly in Great Britain. He called upon Gentlemen to ſay whether they had ever heard of ſuch a character as they were propoſing to create? He ſaid America had conſuls in every part of the world, and if they have not, they ought to have ſalaries for the buſineſs. Why appoint agents, and what authority will they have?

Mr. Sedgwick noticed the different kinds of American citizens, and the difficulties ariſing from the doctrine of inalienable right ſupported by the Engliſh; and obſerved, that when two countries each claim a right to a man, no means but force were left to decide between them.

The reſolution was amended, and a ſelect Committee ordered to prepare a bill. The ſubſtance of which in the next *Cenſor*.

Now, extraordinary as it may ſeem, and much as the reader may be diſappointed, I muſt abſolutely decline making a ſingle remark on this debate. I would, however, recommend it to him to give it an attentive peruſal; after which, by way of recreation, he may read the following dialogue:

Legiſlative Wrangling, à la Mode de Paris.

Mr. Livingſton.—The ſeamen, ſailing under the ſanction of our national flag, have been violently forced into a ſervice they abhor, cruelly torn from their

their dear wives and ſmiling babes, and ignominiouſly ſcourged for aſſerting their privileges as citizens! The country to which they looked for relief has regarded their ſufferings with apathy and indifference. Three long, long years we have beheld their whippings and heard their lamentable cries; yet, for three long, long years we have been ſilent ſpectators of the diſgraceful ſcene! We have begun a compact with their oppreſſors, in which theſe poor dear fellows look with longing eyes in vain for one little tiny article, one ray of hope! *I bluſh*, that an American Miniſter could be *guilty* of this *diſgraceful* omiſſion!

Peter Porcupine.—Mr. Chairman, the Gentleman who ſpoke laſt, has deſcribed the ſufferings of our injured fellow-citizens in a manner that does infinite honour to his feelings. He talks about *bluſhing* and *guilty diſgraceful omiſſions* with a warmth peculiar to himſelf, and admirably calculated to produce what the players call ſtage effect. Indeed, Sir, I cannot help looking on ourſelves as engaged in the performance of a tragedy here: the Gentleman has gone back 2203 years, even to the days of *Euripides*, for his model. The piece will certainly do us honour; but it ſeems to be incomplete without a chorus to throw light on ſome parts of it, that in particular where he ſpeaks of *bluſhing*; and, as I have a few verſes in my hand, which are not quite foreign to the ſubject, I beg leave to read them.

* " In ſhort, to run the Livingſtonian round,
" Where ev'ry trick of knavery is found,
" Cloſe at his heels trots couſin Peter R.
" And M——, a younger, feebler ſtar:
" Two hopeful brothers of a hopeful breed,
" Two thrifty plants of well-approved ſeed,

---

* See Democratiad.

" Who

" Who long have tried, *by arts and meaſures baſe*,
" To lift from filth the remnant of their race;
" A race ſo ſunk, by habit ſo deprav'd,
" So long by vice and infamy enſlav'd;
" So weak, ſo haughty, pompous, proud, and mean,
" Indeed ſo black, ſo ſhameful and obſcene,
" That nought but ſtrength omnipotent can ſave
" Their name deep ſinking in oblivion's wave."

Charity begins at home, ſays the old proverb; and ſo ought *bluſhing*, Mr. Chairman. One would think that a man to whom lines like theſe apply, need lend his cheek to bluſh for nobody, and particularly for the Governor of New-York, one of the brighteſt characters in this or any country. There is more wiſdom, more honeſty, more real patriotiſm in one curl, nay in one ſingle hair of Mr. Jay's wig, than in all the ſkulls of all the Livingſtons, from the days of St. Patrick down to the preſent hour.

Mr. Livingſton.—The Gentleman ſeems to be paying me off *in my own way*.

Peter Porcupine.—No, Sir, by no means; I am paying you at the rate of *twenty ſhillings in the pound*.

Mr. Livingſton.—I ſee the Gentleman is a little nettled. The Houſe know too well the value of what he advances to form a wrong eſtimate of it. I ſhall let him fling his dirt; thank Heaven, it cannot ſoil my character.

Peter Porcupine.—True, Sir; nor is it ſo malicious to fling dirt as to fling *ſtones*. I defy any one to ſay, that I or any of my *family* or *friends*, ever flung ſtones in order to knock out the brains of a man, whoſe arguments I was afraid to hear, becauſe I knew them to be irreſiſtible. The treatment of Mr. Hamilton is a ſtain, an everlaſting ſtain, on the city of New-York. I do not ſcruple to ſay, without diſparagement to a crowd of worthily celebrated men of whom this country may boaſt, that, after General Waſhington, this man has rendered it the

moſt

moſt eſſential ſervices; this very man whom a gang of foreign ruffians were hired to diſpatch. Had one of the miſſiles hurled from their infamous hands ſtruck him on the temple, you might have had the pleaſure of ſeeing him expire at your feet, while we ſhould have mourned the irreparable loſs. Were I to draw your character, Sir, and place it by the ſide of that of Mr. Hamilton; then you would have reaſon to bluſh indeed; a die ten thouſand times deeper than crimſon would become your jaundiced cheek.

Mr. Swanwick.—The Gentleman laſt up ſeems to have loſt ſight of the queſtion altogether. One would think he was contemplating protection to Mr. Hamilton inſtead of American ſeamen. I ſhall endeavour to bring him back to the ſubject before the Committee, reminding him, at the ſame time, that ſuch perſonalities as he deals about him are very derogatory to the dignity of this Houſe.

I am aſtoniſhed that proofs of impreſſments are called for. When we heard of American ſeamen being priſoners *in Algiers*, no evidence was required with reſpect to numbers. The united exertions of the whole American people ſeemed *to cry out* for their releaſement. Let us not be *too nice about evidence*. Theſe men are *ignorant*, and cannot give the neceſſary information.

Peter Porcupine.—Mr. Chairman, I thank the Gentleman for his hint about perſonalities; but he will allow, that I am as excuſable as Mr. Livingſton, who talked about the *ſhameful*, *guilty*, and *diſgraceful* conduct of a moſt upright public Miniſter. I may not have the mellifluent eloquence of the Gentleman laſt up: I know I am a rough-hewn mortal; but, as I am ſpeaking to men, and not to an aſſembly of *little miſſes*, the want of that Gentleman's ſilver liſp may not amount to a total diſqualification.

I ſhall

I ſhall now turn to what the Gentleman has advanced on the ſubject before us —He begs us "not "to be *too nice* about evidence." This is going a ſtep beyond the Revolutionary Tribunal of Paris. There the *accuſer* is heard, and if the jury are ſatisfied of the guilt of the priſoner, *no evidence is heard in his defence*. This is not being over-nice; but we are required to be ſtill leſs nice. The merciful French hear the witneſſes againſt the priſoner at any rate; but we are called upon to give our verdict, without hearing any at all. Poor unfortunate Great Britain is to be condemned upon the bare indictment. One comes forward and accuſes her; ſhe holds up her feeble emaciated hand, and pleads, NOT GUILTY, my Lords. Some of us wiſh to hear what can be urged againſt her; but the Gentleman tells us not to be too nice about evidence; that ſhe is a notorious offender; that "*every* man *knows* it, "though *no one* can give *regular information* of it;" and, in ſhort, that ſhe ought to have been annihilated long ago. In vain do we, like Pontius Pilate, aſk, *For what?* Still they cry with one voice, Let her be crucified! Let her be crucified!—And is it thus we treat our poor old mother in the hour of her diſtreſs?

The Gentleman produces, as a ſufficient reaſon for our not being *too nice*, the great "*ignorance* of "the *citizens* impreſſed." And do I hear this language from Mr. Swanwick? Is it poſſible for the people to be ignorant, while under the rays of this focus of ſcience? Do I live, Mr. Chairman, to hear the words *ignorance* and *citizens* articulated in the ſame breath? How long, Sir, have our ears been dinned with, *an informed people, an enlightened people*; with the deſtruction of ſuperſtition and prejudice, and the luminous cloſe of the eighteenth century? And ſhall we now be told, that our *citizens* are *ignorant?* that they are ſuch ſtupid brutes

brutes as not to be able to give an account of what has befallen them ? not even of their impriſonments and their ſtripes ?

But Mr. Swanwick, after two or three days diligent ſearch, brings us ſomething like an account of ſome men impreſſed from a veſſel *of his own*; and this, he inſiſts, is evidence enough for any reaſonable man. Thus, when a ſailor can be brought to ſay, that he has been impreſſed and ſcourged, he is an *enlightened citizen*; but when he cannot, he is a poor ignorant devil, " not capable of giving the ne- " ceſſary information."

The Gentleman told us ſomething about *Algiers*; and, though I cannot for my ſoul perceive why Algiers was dragged into the debate, I look upon myſelf as entitled to ſay a word or two in reply. " The united exertions," ſays he, " of the whole " American people ſeemed *to cry out* for the releaſe- " ment of the priſoners in Algiers." I believe, Sir, that the people in general were much affected with the fate of thoſe unfortunate men, and that, had proper meaſures been taken to call their feelings into action, the priſoners would long ago have been reſtored to their families and country, without the interpoſition of Government; but no one will deny, that theſe meaſures ſhould have originated with the *merchants*; that the example ſhould have been given, and, indeed, the greateſt part of the money beſtowed, by themſelves. Was this the caſe ? They did, indeed, " *cry out*;" they might, for ought I know, make fervent applications to Heaven; but the applications to their purſes, which had been filled by the toil and hardſhips of theſe poor fellows, were very faint and ineffectual. A ſubſcription was opened in this city; Mr. Swanwick was himſelf one of the receivers; and I now call upon him to ſay, how much his brethren ſubſcribed, and how much he ſubſcribed himſelf. I call upon him to ſay, whe-

ther a company of *foreign players*, yea, even Engliſh players, did not ſubſcribe more than all the merchants of this great, rich, and flouriſhing city! —Here was "apathy and indifference," indeed! Here Mr. Livingſton might have ſeen reaſon to "*bluſh* for a *diſgraceful omiſſion!*"

I am not ſorry that the little Gentleman beſtowed a few of his ſilver ſounds on the ſlaves in Algiers, as it furniſhes me with an opportunity of comparing the conduct of the friends of the reſolution towards thoſe men, and that which they now hold towards ſeamen impreſſed by the Engliſh. The ſlaves in Algiers could have been at any time ranſomed, and we well know that they were *all* real *Americans*. The ſeamen impreſſed are indefinite; we know not who or where they are; all we know about them is, that they are *all*, or nearly ſo, ſubjects of the King of Great Britain. Now, how comes it, that theſe gentlemen ſhow ſuch amazing zeal, and are ſo deeply touched with what they gravely call the *ſufferings* of the ſubjects of his Britannic Majeſty, while they ſhow ſuch indifference for our own citizens? This ſeems totally unaccountable; yet, Mr. Chairman, I think I can explain it in a few words. The impreſſment of *Britiſh* ſeamen by the Britiſh forms a ſubject of oppoſition to the treaty; any meaſures taken to reſiſt that impreſſment may lead to a war; the expenſe attending the agents ſent out will come from the public purſe, and not from the purſe of theſe gentlemen. None of theſe weighty reaſons exiſted with reſpect to the ſlaves in Algiers; and therefore they might have remained there, till they had rotted in their chains, had not that Government which theſe ſticklers for humanity now accuſe of apathy and indifference, been much more vigilant and humane than they.

I have much more to ſay on this ſubject, Sir; but as the hour of Turkey and Madeira is at hand,

I ſit down, in order to give the Houſe an opportunity of adjourning.

(To be concluded in the Cenſor for April.)

Narrative of the Suicide of the Argus of New-York.

OF all the acts ariſing from folly, wickedneſs, or deſpair, that of ſuicide is beſt calculated to awaken curioſity. It is ſo hard to be accounted for from the common evils incident to life, and is ſuch a direct violation of the firſt law of nature, that a man muſt poſſeſs an extraordinary degree of ſtoiciſm, not to feel ſome inclination to be informed of the cauſe. For my part, I felt this inclination ſo forcibly, upon hearing of the fate of the renowned *Argus*, that I could not reſt till I had obtained a circumſtantial account of the whole affair. I truſt, it is unneceſſary to ſay how my breaſt has been wrung by this melancholy relation; nevertheleſs, I ſhould not think I diſcharged my duty as *Cenſor*, did I neglect to impart it to my readers.

By way of preface to this narrative, it may not be amiſs to give ſome account of the wonderful two-legged creature who is the ſubject of it.

His name indicates that he has a hundred eyes, which is a real fact. Theſe eyes, like thoſe of the beaſt in the viſion, are divided between his fore and hinder parts; but in other reſpects they reſemble thoſe of the lamper eel: that is, they emit filth and noxious matter, in place of admitting light; or, in other words, they anſwer none of the uſeful purpoſes of this organ in other animals. He is extremely vindictive and ferocious; and though his ſtupid eyes are too dim to wound in the manner of the baſiliſk, yet when he has no other means of vengeance left, he drops tears that ſcald and burn like *aqua fortis*.

Theſe

Theſe qualities could not fail to recommend him to the great Citizen Genet, of ſeditious and inſolent memory. He very ſoon became the Citizen's chief favourite, and is ſuppoſed to have drunk deeply at the fountain of his largeſſes. From motives of gratitude, therefore, he was deſperately attached to the cauſe of the French Republic. He has written, ſworn, and lied in that cauſe; and, of all the tools of faction, has, perhaps, been the moſt ſteady to his truſt. He has chanted the Marſeillois Hymn, and celebrated all the ſucceſsful maſſacres of his benefactors, with that kind of ſavage joy that animates the ravages of beaſts of prey.

But, alas! how tranſitory are all ſublunary things! The diſgraceful defeats, or, to uſe their own expreſſion, "the *little ſucceſs*," of his maſters, during the laſt campaign, plunged him into a ſtate of dejection, from which he was only raiſed to be ſunk over head and ears in deſpair. Like many other charitable patriots, he was buoyed up by the hope of a rebellion, or, to give it the faſhionable term, of a *revolution*, in Great Britain; and this event was reduced to a certainty by the account concerning the *Sedition Bills*, which our induſtrious, and faithful, and impartial newſmongers ſpread through the country.

This, then, was the rock of our *Argus*'s hope: ſtill, however, he had his doubts and his fears, and theſe were left to fluctuate during the wide chaſm in our foreign intelligence. Nothing torments and haraſſes the mind like ſuſpenſe. The poor *Argus* became penſive and melancholy, was often ſeen to ſtop in the middle of the ſtreet, and heard to mutter incoherent expreſſions about rebellion and *Sedition Bills*, and Pitt and King George, or Citizen Guelph, as he called him.

On Wedneſday, the fatal 23d of March, about a quarter after ſix in the morning, he was perceived with

with a ſpying-glaſs in his hand, walking on the battery oppoſite the port. He was obſerved to ſtop often and clap the glaſs to one of his eyes, then ſcratch his head, clench his fiſt, and give other evident tokens of anger or madneſs. At laſt, turning himſelf towards the water, he laid the teleſcope to his ſhoulder, as if it were a gun, and, after making a motion to fire, uttered a loud cry, and ran down to the beach. Two labourers, who had viewed him all this time, now loſt ſight of him. One of them haſtened to the ſpot, where he found the poor diſtracted wretch belabouring a log which had been thrown up by the tide. His left hand was all over blood, and the teleſcope was reduced to ſplinters, except about four inches of it, which he ſtill gripped faſt in his right. Upon being aſked what was the matter? "Look," ſays he, holding his bloody hand to the man, "look, my lad, that's the heart's "blood of Pitt: no pity! no pity! let's to the pa-"lace, and cut all their throats!"

The other workman now came up; and the two together, with the help of a third perſon, made ſhift to get him home, without further miſchief. This was not effected, however, without ſome danger; for, as he conceived himſelf going to Newgate, as a preparative for a voyage to Botany Bay, there is not a mean of annoyance that he did not make uſe of, or an execration that he did not vomit forth.

When he was put to bed, he ſwore he was on a rack a million times crueller than that of Damien. "Raſcals," ſays he, "I have only killed a Miniſ-"ter. I have only done my duty as a citizen and a "patriot." Theſe ravings continued for nearly two hours, after which, having been copiouſly bled, he dropt off to ſleep.

About four in the afternoon he awaked, when to the joy of his friends, and the ſurpriſe of every body,

he ſeemed perfectly reſtored to his ſenſes. He ate a baſin of panada, drank a little wine and water, and appeared quite recovered, except from the bruiſes he received from the ribs of Miniſter Log.

Juſt as things were taking this happy turn, one of his printers brought word that a ſhip was that moment arrived from Liverpool, bringing news to the end of February. This imprudent communication was the cauſe of an immediate relapſe. He jumped up, and, without either hat or coat, ran down to the wharf, from whence he got on board the veſſel. "Well," ſays he, with a voice and look that ſcared the whole crew, "well, raſcals, you are "come at laſt. Tell me this moment, are the "*Bills* paſſed?"—The Captain anſwered, *Yes*. "What!" ſays the raving *Argus*, "the Bills paſſed, "and no revolution!" *None*, ſays the Captain.—"What! the Engliſh are not cutting one another's "throats yet?"—*No*, ſays the humane tarpawling, *more is the pity; but let us hope, for the love of God, that they will begin ſoon*.—This charitable informant had hardly done ſpeaking, when our poor unfortunate friend made an attempt to throw himſelf over the quarter-deck. Being prevented here, he aſſumed a placid mien, pretended he was only in a joke, though it was evident to every one he was but too much in earneſt. Soon after this he ſlipped from among the crowd (which was very conſiderable on account of the great news that was expected), and got away on the forecaſtle, where he was preparing to hang himſelf. He had even got the cord round his neck, when he was perceived by a man upon the yards. His intentions were now ſo manifeſt, that it would have been downright inhumanity to neglect him any longer. He was conducted home by ſome of the citizens, and put under the care of his own people.

Arrived

Arrived once more at his home, he ſeems to have been reſolved to defer the execution of his deſperate deſign no longer. He diſſembled, however; talked very connectedly; inquired whether the paper was nearly compoſed or not, and even ſat down and took his pen, under pretence of writing an article of news. By theſe means he prevailed on his people to leave him alone; two of them, however, thought it prudent to remain at the head of the ſtairs, in order to be at hand, ſhould he make any attempt on his life. Their ſuſpicions were but too well founded; for at the end of half an hour's dead ſilence, they heard him utter a moſt dreadful groan, and, preſently after, fall on the floor. They attempted to force the door, but it was too ſecurely faſtened. They then applied to the wainſcot, and, at laſt, made an opening, when, ſhocking to relate! they found their dear maſter weltering in his blood, his throat being cut nearly acroſs. A ſurgeon was inſtantly called, and every aſſiſtance given; but, I am ſorry to add, that, when this morning's poſt came away, there was little hope of recovery.

The interval between his entering his apartment and perpetration of the horrid deed, was, it ſeems, employed in writing a farewell letter to his ſiſter and only relation, the *Aurora* of Philadelphia. I am promiſed a copy of this letter, which, if obtained, ſhall find a place in the next *Cenſor*.

It is ſaid, with what truth I do not pretend to aſcertain, that the inſtrument with which the fatal gaſh was given, was one of the long *couteaux* employed in the priſons of Paris, and was a *keepſake* from a very intimate friend now in France.

THE END OF CENSOR, NO. II.

POLITICAL CENSOR.

No. III.

Debates in the Houſe of Repreſentatives.
(Continued from Page 296.)

MR. S. SMITH obſerved, that, "were there but "*one man*, and he a *negro*, ſuffering under the gall- "ing *yoke* of *impriſonment*, it was the duty of the "Government to provide *relief* for that man." Now, Mr. Smith, have you not ſeveral negroes? How eaſy, then, is it for you to do an act of philanthropy, without application to the Government, and without plunging the country into a dangerous diſpute with another nation? You will ſay, without doubt, that your negroes are not ſuffering under the galling "yoke of impreſſment;" but, where is the difference whether they are under the yoke of the Britiſh, or under your yoke? Slavery is ſtill ſlavery; nor is the yoke the weight of a hair lighter, for laſting durante vita, or becauſe it is impoſed by a man who pretends to be the advocate of liberty.

Nothing that I have ſaid, or ſhall ſay on this ſubject, is intended to juſtify the Britiſh in their impreſſment of *Americans:* I look upon their conduct in this reſpect as tyrannical; as the effect of that overbearing inſolence which is the characteriſtic of but too many among their ſubaltern officers; and I think that redreſs ought to be obtained with all convenient ſpeed. But I here confine myſelf to *Americans alone*, by which word I mean, thoſe who were born in the United States, or were inhabitants of them at the

peace of 1783, not including *deſerters from the Britiſh during the war.* Theſe are Americans, and no others are; and I venture to predict, that whatever ſchemes the Congreſs may fall on, whatever regiſters, certificates, or oaths of civiſm they may think proper to furniſh ſailors with, Great Britain will ever ſeize hers where ſhe finds them.

Mr. LIVINGSTON ſaid, that "it would be no "difficult matter to prove, that foreigners naturalized ſince the declaration of independence, were "entitled to the protection of the Government."—He attempted to prove this, but I ſhall not contradict him, for the thing is in itſelf ſo evidently abſurd, as to need no remark. As to what he pleaſes to call the *naturalization of foreigners* (whole cargoes at a time, or otherwiſe), the rights of citizenſhip they enjoy under their new maſters, &c. ſhall be reſerved for a future opportunity. It will be ſufficient to add, on this article, that a bill was at laſt agreed to for appointing agents for the relief and protection of impreſſed ſeamen. But if theſe agents are to be employed (as the inſtruments of a predominant faction) to embroil this country in a war, it were far better they had never been appointed.

Papers relative to the Treaty with Great Britain.

March 2.

Mr. LIVINGSTON (from *N. York)* ſaid, that it was generally underſtood that ſome important conſtitutional queſtion would be diſcuſſed, when the treaty lately concluded between this country and Great Britain ſhould come under conſideration: it was very deſirable, therefore, that every document which might tend to throw light on the ſubject ſhould be before the Houſe. For this purpoſe he would move the following reſolution:

"Reſolved, That the Preſident of the United "States be requeſted to lay before this Houſe, a copy "of

" of the inſtructions given to the Miniſter of the " United States who negotiated the treaty with Great " Britain, communicated by his meſſage on the 1ſt " inſt. together with the correſpondence and docu- " ments relative to the ſaid treaty."—Ordered to lie on the table.

To this reſolution the following exception was afterwards added:—" Excepting ſuch of the ſaid " papers as any exiſting negotiation may render im- " proper to be diſcloſed."

Mr. TRACY *(Connecticut)* requeſted the Gentleman who brought forward this reſolution to give his reaſons for doing ſo. He had at preſent only told the Houſe that, as the conſtitutionality of the treaty might be diſcuſſed, he thought it neceſſary to propoſe the meaſure. It was well known by every man in that Houſe, that much difference of opinion, and much ſenſibility, had been occaſioned by the treaty in queſtion all over the Union. He thought that the only way to treat the matter fairly, would be, for every Member on that floor to come forward and expreſs himſelf openly. Perhaps the happineſs of the country might depend upon the iſſue of their deliberations upon it. In order to avoid all bitterneſs and miſunderſtanding, it would be beſt for members to come forward at firſt and ſtate their opinions fully. He therefore aſked, why this motion was made? If made barely to enable the Houſe to examine into the conſtitutionality of the treaty, he thought that might be determined by comparing it with the Conſtitution itſelf. It may be thought neceſſary that theſe papers be produced in order to impeach any of the perſons employed in the negotiation, or the Preſident. He wiſhed to know for what purpoſe theſe papers are called. He thought to declare the whole intention of the motion would be a mean of harmonizing the Houſe upon the ſubject. However, until he knew the real intention, he would hope it was

a good one. If he diſagreed from the honourable Mover, he ſhould give his reaſons for it. It was a delicate ſubject. That they had a right to the papers called for, for a good purpoſe, could not be doubted; but unleſs the Houſe had real occaſion for them, the Preſident would be juſtified in keeping them where they are. What, ſaid he, do we want with theſe papers? Is it to make a better treaty, or to do away the one made? He wiſhed to know the Mover's reaſons fully.

Mr. Livingston ſaid, he had never any wiſh to conceal his intention, as he truſted he never ſhould have any which he ſhould be aſhamed to avow. The Gentleman aſked with propriety for information; he anſwered, his motion was made for the purpoſe of gaining information. He aſked, to what particular point? It may be to all the points he has mentioned. It was impoſſible to know, until the papers were before him. He wiſhed for information: the reſult would depend upon the information received. He did not know that the impeachment of any perſon would be determined upon by that Houſe. He did not think ſo himſelf; but he thought it neceſſary they ſhould have an opportunity of making a fair judgment of the matter. They were the proper perſons to whom was delegated the power of puniſhing officers; they ought, therefore, to have full opportunity of judging of their conduct. It was ſimply for information that the reſolution aſked, not only with reſpect to the officers who were employed on the occaſion, but with reſpect to the thing itſelf. He believed that Houſe had the power to carry into effect any treaty, or not. It was for this purpoſe that he wanted information; and if the Houſe were of the ſame opinion, they would ſupport the motion. Something had been ſaid as to the delicacy of the ſubject. If, ſaid he, any reaſon of ſtate will not permit the Preſident to give the papers they aſked for, he will give his reaſons for refuſing them. He meant

meant not to invade the rights of any branch of Government; it was information which he ſought for.

Mr. GILES *(Virginia)* ſaid he would briefly ſtate the reaſons which induced him to ſupport the paſſing of the reſolutions which lay on the table. The Gentleman from Connecticut had juſtly ſaid that the treaty had cauſed great ſenſibility throughout the United States. It was on this account that he wanted that information which they had a right to expect, and without which they could not proceed to conſider the ſubject. If he were to judge of the treaty itſelf, it would not allay that ſenſibility which had been raiſed againſt it; but he truſted the information which was called for would be of a ſort to reconcile the public mind. If no information was given, he muſt own it would have an unfavourable impreſſion on his mind. He wiſhed, therefore, for information.

Mr. MURRAY *(Maryland)* obſerved, that if the Mover of the reſolution before the Houſe had clearly declared that the object of it was for information, he ſhould not have an objection to it; but the explanation given led him to believe that it had in view the eſtabliſhment of a very alarming doctrine—no leſs than to determine, whether the treaty ſhall be carried into effect, or not. By the Conſtitution he ſaid the treaty was become the law of the land, and obligatory on all the citizens of the United States. From the explanation given, he ſhould give the meaſure his decided negative; for if that Houſe had the power to decide on the legality of the treaty, in vain has the Conſtitution given power to the Preſident and Senate to make treaties. It appeared to him that the Houſe had no right to inquire into the particular ground upon which this treaty has become the law of the land, ſince it appears that the Preſident and Senate have acted agreeably to the Conſtitution. It would be a ſoleciſm in government to ſay,

ſay, that there were two powers which could control each other. He thought the reſolution unconſtitutional, as it was predicated on the right of that Houſe to interfere with the power placed in the Preſident and Senate to make treaties. In order to juſtify this motion, the Houſe ſhould firſt determine the treaty to be unconſtitutional, and that it ought not to be the law of the land. If it was agreed that that Houſe had a right to examine all the ſecrets attending negotiations, a plan will be adopted which may open ſecrets that may be of great injury to the nation. Every man knows, ſaid he, that in diplomatic tranſactions there are certain ſecret negotiations; he did not know that it was the caſe in this, but it might be ſo. To carry into effect this reſolution, appeared to him a direct invaſion upon the conſtitutional rights placed in the Preſident in conjunction with the Senate. He doubted whether the Senate could make this demand.

Thus did the diſcuſſion wander from its object. This motion of Mr. Livingſton was the ſignal of hoſtile preparation. The friends of the treaty took the alarm; and the queſtion became, not whether the Houſe had a right to call for the papers or not, but whether their ſanction was neceſſary to the execution of a treaty.

The debates occupied the Houſe and the public during nearly a month. It is incompatible with my plan to give the ſpeeches at length, many of which do honour to the hearts, and many others to the heads of the ſpeakers: among the former may be noticed thoſe of Meſſrs. Buck, Sedgwick, Harper, and William Smith; among the latter, thoſe of Meſſrs. Gallatin and Giles.

The reſolution was finally carried, and on the 31ſt of March the Houſe received the following meſſage from the Preſident, in reply.

" *Gentlemen*

" *Gentlemen of the Houſe of Repreſentatives,*

" With the utmoſt attention I have conſidered " your reſolution of the 24th inſt. requeſting me to " lay before your Houſe a copy of the inſtructions to " the Miniſter of the United States who negotiated " the treaty with the King of Great Britain, toge- " ther with the correſpondence and other docu- " ments relative to that treaty, excepting ſuch of " the ſaid papers as any exiſting negotiation may " render improper to be diſcloſed.

" In deliberating upon this ſubject, it was impoſ- " ſible for me to loſe ſight of the principle which " ſome have avowed in its diſcuſſion, or to avoid " extending my views to the conſequences which " muſt flow from the admiſſion of that principle.

" I truſt that no part of my conduct has ever " indicated a diſpoſition to withhold any informa- " tion which the Conſtitution has enjoined upon " the Preſident as a duty to give, or which could " be required of him by either Houſe of Congreſs " as a right; and with truth I affirm, that it has " been, as it will continue to be, while I have the " honour to preſide in the government, my conſtant " endeavour to harmonize with the other branches " thereof, ſo far as the truſt delegated to me by the " people of the United States, and my ſenſe of the " obligation it impoſes to preſerve, protect, and de- " fend the Conſtitution, will permit.

" The nature of foreign negotiations requires " caution; and their ſucceſs muſt often depend on " ſecrecy; and even when brought to a concluſion, " a full diſcloſure of all the meaſures, demands, or " eventual conceſſions which may have been pro- " poſed or contemplated, would be extremely im- " politic; for this might have a pernicious in- " fluence on future negotiations; or produce im- " mediate inconveniencies, perhaps danger and " miſchief,

" miſchief, in relation to other powers. The neceſ-
" ſity of ſuch caution and ſecrecy was one cogent
" reaſon for veſting the power of making treaties in
" the Preſident, with the advice and conſent of the
" Senate; the principle on which that body was
" formed confining it to a ſmall number of mem-
" bers. To admit then a right in the Houſe of
" Repreſentatives to demand, and to have as a
" matter of courſe, all the papers reſpecting a ne-
" gotiation with a foreign power, would be to eſta-
" bliſh a dangerous precedent.

" It does not occur, that the inſpection of the
" papers aſked for can be relative to any purpoſe
" under the cognizance of the Houſe of Repreſent-
" atives, except that of an impeachment; which
" the reſolution has not expreſſed. I repeat that I
" have no diſpoſition to withhold any information
" which the duty of my ſtation will permit, or the
" public good ſhall require to be diſcloſed; and,
" in fact, all the papers affecting the negotiation
" with Great Britain were laid before the Senate
" when the treaty itſelf was communicated for their
" conſideration and advice.

" The courſe which the debate has taken on the
" reſolution of the Houſe, leads to ſome obſerva-
" tions on the mode of making treaties under the
" Conſtitution of the United States.

" Having been a member of the General Con-
" vention, and knowing the principles on which
" the Conſtitution was formed, I have ever enter-
" tained but one opinion on this ſubject; and from
" the firſt eſtabliſhment of the government to this
" moment, my conduct has exemplified that opi-
" nion, that the power of making treaties is ex-
" cluſively veſted in the Preſident, by and with
" the advice and conſent of the Senate, pro-
" vided two thirds of the Senators preſent concur;
" and that every treaty ſo made and promulgated,

" thenceforward becomes the law of the land. It " is thus the treaty-making power has been under- " ſtood by foreign nations; and in all the treaties " made with them *we* have declared, and *they* have " believed, that, when ratified by the Preſident, " with the advice and conſent of the Senate, they " become obligatory. In the conſtruction of the " Conſtitution every Houſe of Repreſentatives has " heretofore acquieſced; and until the preſent time " not a doubt or ſuſpicion has appeared, to my " knowledge, that this conſtruction was not the " true one. Nay, they have more than acqui- " eſced; for, till now, without controverting the " obligation of ſuch treaties, they have made all the " requiſite proviſions for carrying them into effect.

" There is alſo reaſon to believe that this con- " ſtruction agrees with the opinions entertained by " the State conventions, when they were delibe- " rating on the Conſtitution, eſpecially by thoſe " who objected to it, becauſe there was not required, " in *commercial treaties*, the conſent of two thirds of " the whole number of the members of the Se- " nate, inſtead of two thirds of the Senators pre- " ſent, and becauſe in treaties reſpecting territo- " rial and certain other rights and claims, the con- " currence of three fourths of the whole number " of the members of both Houſes, reſpectively, was " not made neceſſary.

" It is a fact declared by the General Convention, " and univerſally underſtood, that the Conſtitution of " the United States was the reſult of a ſpirit of amity " and mutual conceſſion. And it is well known " that, under this influence, the ſmaller States were " admitted to an equal repreſentation in the Senate, " with the larger States; and that this branch of the " Government was inveſted with great powers; for " on the equal participation of thoſe powers, the

" ſovereignty

" ſovereignty and political ſafety of the ſmaller " States were deemed eſſentially to depend.

" If other proofs than theſe, and the plain letter " of the Conſtitution itſelf, be neceſſary to aſcertain " the point under conſideration, they may be found " in the Journals of the General Convention, which " I have depoſited in the office of the department of " State. In thoſe journals it will appear, that a " propoſition was made, 'that no treaty ſhould be " binding on the United States which was not ratified by a law,' and that the propoſition was explicitly rejected.

" As, therefore, it is perfectly clear to my underſtanding, that the aſſent of the Houſe of Repreſentatives is not neceſſary to the validity of a " treaty; as the treaty with Great Britain exhibits " in itſelf all the objects requiring legiſlative proviſion, and on theſe the papers called for can throw " no light; and as it is eſſential to the due adminiſtration of the Government, that the boundaries " fixed by the Conſtitution between the different " departments ſhould be preſerved; a juſt regard to " the Conſtitution and to the duty of my office, " under all the circumſtances of this caſe, forbid a " compliance with your requeſt."

Remarks.—Nobody will deny, that the Houſe of Repreſentatives have *a right* to call for papers of every kind, relative to matters laid before them; nor will any one deny, that the Preſident has an equal *right* to refuſe them. The neceſſity of the call can alone render it juſtifiable in point of propriety; and, conſequently, if no ſuch neceſſity exiſts, a refuſal on the part of the Preſident cannot be improper.

Three reaſons were urged in favour of the call: 1. Something might be diſcovered that would juſtify an impeachment; 2. The papers might throw light on ſome parts of the treaty; 3. They might contain

ſomething,

ſomething, which would tend to reconcile the people to that inſtrument.

With reſpect to the firſt of theſe—*diſcovering grounds for an impeachment*—I would aſk, who could have been the object of this impeachment? Not the negotiator certainly; for, whatever might be his conduct at the court of London, it had received the ſolemn ſanction of the Preſident and Senate. He was charged with powers to make a treaty; he had done ſo; and thoſe who had diſpatched him, had approved and ratified the reſult of his negotiation: if, therefore, there was any blame, it muſt fall on thoſe under whoſe orders he acted, and not on him.

I preſume the idea of impeaching the Senate never entered the brains of even Virginians, and of courſe the Preſident muſt be the object. But *the papers might throw light on ſome parts of the treaty.* Now I, who am no ſtateſman, God knows, have read this treaty, and I think I underſtand it perfectly well. It is in good plain Engliſh, and, though that may be one of its principal faults with the quibblers from the South, yet it ought to render explanatory papers unneceſſary. Will any one of the oppoſition members ſay, that he does not underſtand the treaty? If he ſays ſo, will it not be neceſſary to ſend him back to his conſtituents, or furniſh him with an interpreter? I confeſs that the outlandiſh gentlemen, ſuch as Mr. *Gallatin* for example, may experience ſerious difficulties on this account; but is this to authorize a call that would divulge all the ſecrets of the State? would it not be infinitely better to have the treaty tranſlated into *Italian*, or, like the French decrees of fraternity, into all the living languages? Beſides, let it be remembered, that the papers called for are in Engliſh as well as the treaty, and of courſe thoſe who do not underſtand the latter would not underſtand the former.

I would

I would by no means infinuate here, that all the oppofition members, who are not foreigners, are adequate to a full comprehenfion of the treaty; for though, like the *Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, they talk tolerably good profe, without knowing it, their fpeeches fully prove that they know but little of the merits of the treaty. And to them, as to foreigners, the fame queftion will apply: If they cannot underftand the treaty, how are they to underftand the papers? Moft people, I believe, will allow, that a diplomatic correfpondence is more difficult to analyfe than the inftrument in queftion; and if fo, how is it poffible that thefe contracted minds fhould derive light from fuch a correfpondence?

Some of the members of oppofition are, however, of a different ftamp. Thefe did not want light; they are blefled with that in the extreme degree. The rays ftrike on their minds with fuch force as to blind every principle of honour and honefty. From the fineffe of thefe gentlemen what could have been expected from the papers? That profound politician patriot *Madifon* found out *five* different conftructions of one fingle claufe of the Conftitution; and perhaps he would have found five times the number of every claufe in the difpatches. Where or when could this have ended?

It is fomething truly aftonifhing, that papers, or any thing elfe, fhould, at this late hour, be called for, in order to throw light on the Britifh treaty. There have been, upon a moderate computation, more than fifty volumes in folio written and printed on the fubject; public meetings have been held on it in every corner of the Union; petitions by hundreds have been given in for and againft it; and the inftrument itfelf has been in the hands of every one during the fpace of eight months. Where, then, do thefe people come from, who now want papers to throw

throw light on the ſubject; if, indeed, they can prove, that they have been buried in the weſtern woods, plotting "political ſins" anew, or conſtantly occupied in driving their negro *conſtituents* to the tobacco-fields and home again, I ſhall be ready to make an allowance for their ignorance; but if they cannot prove this, if they have enjoyed the ſame means of information as thoſe enjoyed by every man in the *free* States, and are yet ignorant of the merits or demerits of the treaty, I muſt abſolutely declare them too ſtupid to judge of it at all, and totally unworthy of having an intricate diplomatic correſpondence ſubmitted to their examination.

But, allowing that the papers might have thrown light on ſome parts of the treaty, how was this neceſſary to their deciding on granting the ſupplies neceſſary to carry it into effect? for it is for this purpoſe alone that a treaty is laid before them. We will ſuppoſe, for a moment, that they had diſcovered that Mr. Jay had gone beyond, or fallen ſhort of his inſtructions; nay, we will even ſuppoſe that they had found as indubitable proofs of Engliſh corruption, as they have had of French corruption; how could that circumſtance have affected their deciſion? If they have a right of exerciſing their judgment with reſpect to a treaty, it muſt be on the treaty itſelf; and that was before them. The means employed in the negotiation could not alter the inſtrument itſelf. It has a preciſe meaning, couched in terms which cannot be miſunderſtood; and on that meaning alone could they found their deciſion. What an idiot of a connoiſſeur ſhould we think him, who, upon the ſight of a picture, ſhould call for the pencils with which it was painted, in order to form an opinion of its merits! Yet, exactly ſuch was the call for papers relative to the treaty.

There was, however, another reaſon aſſigned: *theſe papers might contain ſomething, which would ten*

to reconcile the people to the inſtrument. I could have excuſed every thing but this groſs, this palpable hypocriſy. What! did theſe oppoſition members deſire to ſee ſomething that would reconcile the people to the treaty?—theſe very men who had, in ways more or leſs direct, ſtipulated with the mob to oppoſe it. It is a fact well known, that the leaders among them had all written or made public ſpeeches repreſentiug it as inimical to the rights and liberties of the people; the Gentleman who brought forward the reſolution was one of thoſe who took the lead at New-York, when the *French* and American flags were hoiſted againſt it, and when it was abſolutely burnt before the houſe of Governor Jay. And yet theſe very men now pretend, that they wiſh for ſomething that may reconcile the people to it! What an opinion muſt they have of the Preſident, to ſuppoſe him open to ſuch barefaced deception! When men have long ſucceeded in this, or any way, they are apt to over-rate their talents; it is not therefore ſo very wonderful that they ſhould imagine it is as eaſy to cajole General Waſhington as their deluded conſtituents.

I have now done with the *pretended* motives of the reſolution (on which I muſt confeſs I have taken up too much of the reader's time), and ſhall come to what I imagine to be the *real* motives of it.

To begin at the fountain-head, the mind from which the miſchievous and malicious idea firſt iſſued: it is tolerably well known, that the *Livingſtons* harbour a mortal hatred againſt the family of his Excellency Governor *Jay*, which hatred is undoubtedly paid back with contempt. The characters of the parties ſufficiently explain the cauſe. This is not the firſt inſtance of private reſentment finding its way into public aſſemblies. Something in theſe papers might have been found, which, if properly handled, would have impreſſed on the minds

minds of the ignorant, a belief that Mr. Jay had abandoned their intereſts; that he was partial to the Engliſh nation (which alone is a ſufficient crime), and that he felt little anxiety for the ſucceſs of the French. The ſlighteſt expreſſion, leaning this way, would have been tortured into the moſt odious ſignification by men who are capable of finding five different conſtructions of a ſimple ſentence. There could not be imagined a more complete method of rendering the worthy Envoy odious to the majority, *in numbers*, of his State, and of preparing the way for his being rejected at another election.

But though this might be the principal object with the "*honourable* Mover," as he has been ironically called, yet we muſt not ſuppoſe all the members of Oppoſition to have no higher views. They undoubtedly participate with Mr. *Livingſton* in a deteſtation of the Envoy. I preſume this, becauſe it is natural; but their projects ſeem to be much more extenſive than the cuſting of a Governor. Their eyes are fixed on another quarter, where a nobler game preſents itſelf. In ſhort, if I have any penetration, their plan is nothing ſhort of driving the Preſident of the United States from the poſt he now fills.

If there be any one who, meaſuring the hearts of others by his own, looks upon this as impoſſible, I requeſt him to turn his eye to the inſults that have been heaped on this man during the preſent ſeſſion of Congreſs. The fact is, nobody doubts of this; and the only thing that ſurpriſes me, is, nobody attempts to render the deſtructive project abortive.

It may be aſked, what views can the Oppoſition have? To this queſtion I anſwer by another: what views have the diſorganizers in every country? What views could the *nobleman* have who propoſed, in France, the abolition of *nobility?* What views had the *biſhop* who propoſed the abolition of *religion?*

What views had the ſilly Lord Stanhope when he propoſed an imitation of the French ſans-culottes, and declared *he would like to be hanged?* Is there any thing too ſtupid, abſurd, and vile, to be wiſhed for by thoſe who are the partiſans of France?

That they may not ſucceed, is ſurely the ſincere deſire of every man who wiſhes well to his country. But the event is, at leaſt, doubtful. It requires fortitude ſomething more than human, to endure ſuch treatment as the Preſident has received, without yielding to the dictates of diſguſt. There is hardly a man on earth but himſelf, that would not have retired long ago. For my part, I ſhould have hurled the papers in their face, in the midſt of their quibbling and ſpiteful harangues, ſent them my reſignation, and retired to my home. Happily, General Waſhington is a man of another character. But it is not reaſonable to hope that he will bear this tantalizing for ever: there is a certain point beyond which the patience and fortitude of no man can go; and ſhould his ungrateful enemies ſurpaſs it, we muſt expect to be left adrift in the ſtorm.

I have hitherto deferred giving the reader the Ayes and Noes on the call for papers, in order that they may appear in this place, after the motives of the reſolution have been, as I preſume, fairly ſtated. Here they follow; and the reader will do well to recollect, that, however they may ſhift hereafter, this is the liſt to which he may at all times refer, to know who are the friends and who are the enemies of the government, conſtitution, peace, and proſperity of the United States.

Ayes.—Meſſieurs Baily, Baird, Baldwin, Benton, Blount, Brent, Bryan, Burgeſs, Cabel, *Chriſtie*, Claibourne, Clopton, Coles, Dearborn, *Dent*, *Duval*, Earl, *Findley*, Franklin, *Gallatin*, Gilleſpie, Giles, Gregg, Greenup, Grove, Hampton, Hancock, Harriſon, *Hathorn*, *Havens*, Heath, Holland, Jackſon,

Jackſon, *Kitchell*, *Livingſton*, Locke, *IV. Lyman*, *Maclay*, Macon, Madiſon, Milledge, Moore, *Muhlenberg*, New, Nicholas, Orr, Page, Parker, *Patton*, Preſton, Richard, Rutherford, Sherborn, Iſrael Smith. *Samuel Smith*, *Sprigg*, *Swanwick*, Tatem, *Van-Courtlandt*, *Varnum*, Venable, Winn.—62.

NAYS.—Meſſieurs *Bourne*, *Bradbury*, *Buck*, *Coit*, *Cooper*, *A. Foſter*, *D. Foſter*, *Freeman*, *Gill*, *Gilman*, *Glen*, *Goodhue*, *Goodrich*, *Griſwald*, Harper, *Hartley*, *Hillhouſe*, *Hindman*, *Kittera*, *S. Lyman*, *Malbone*, *Murray*, *Reed*, *Sedgwick*, *Sitgreaves*, *Jeremiah Smith*, *N. Smith*, *Iſaac Smith*, W. Smith, *Swift*, *Thatcher*, *Thomas*, *Thompſon*, *Tracey*, *Van-Allen*, *Wadſworth*, *Williams*.—37.

It is a truth, which cannot be too often repeated, that the oppoſers of the Britiſh treaty are, for the moſt part, men who have long and ſteadily oppoſed every ſalutary meaſure of the General Government, joined by ſuch as this treaty obliged to pay their juſt debts. It is well known that it is againſt the ſouthern States alone that the Britiſh merchants complain; and for this reaſon it is that we ſee the members from thoſe States moſt oppoſed to it. All the names in the above liſts, written in *italics*, are of members coming from States to the north of Virginia, from which it will appear, that only two members from the ſouthern States voted in the minority. This circumſtance is a ſufficient proof of the motives of the Oppoſition.

Reſolution by way of Proteſt againſt the Preſident's Meſſage.

April 26.

The Houſe having reſolved itſelf into a Committee of the whole on the meſſage from the Preſident, *Mr. Blount* (from North Carolina) moved the following reſolutions, which were finally paſſed.

Reſolved, that, it being declared by the ſecond ſection of the ſecond article of the Conſtitution, "that the Preſident ſhall have power, by and with "the advice and conſent of the Senate, to make "treaties, provided two thirds of the Senate preſent "concur," the Houſe of Repreſentatives do not claim any agency in *making treaties*; but that when a treaty ſtipulates regulations *on any of the ſubjects ſubmitted by the Conſtitution to the power of Congreſs*, it muſt depend for its execution, as to ſuch ſtipulations, on a law or laws to be paſſed by Congreſs; and it is the conſtitutional right and duty of the Houſe of Repreſentatives, in all ſuch caſes, to deliberate on the expediency or inexpediency of carrying ſuch treaties into effect, and to determine and act thereon, as in *their judgment* may be moſt conducive to the public good.

Reſolved, that it is not neceſſary to the propriety of any application from this Houſe to the Executive for information deſired by them, and which may relate to any conſtitutional functions of the Houſe, that the purpoſes for which ſuch information may be wanted, or to which the ſame may be applied, ſhould be ſtated in the application.

On the latter of theſe reſolutions it is only neceſſary to obſerve, that it is by no means inconſiſtent with the motives that dictated the call for papers; thoſe motives I have already ſtated, it will therefore be uſeleſs to ſay any thing more on the reſolution.

The firſt reſolution merits a great deal of attention, as it ſeems to be the laſting definition of the treaty-making power.

Patriot Madiſon was the only Member that entered into a defence of this reſolution. To give his ſpeech here would be to fill up my pages with what no one would read: I ſhall, therefore, content myſelf with inſerting an extract from the debates in the Virginia Convention, at the time when the Conſti-

tution of the United States was under conſideration.

The reader ſhould be informed, that this *patriot* was, at the time of forming the Conſtitution, a firm friend to it; and indeed I have ſeen it aſſerted in print, that he even drew it up. Let us, then, compare the explanation he gave of this treaty-making clauſe, at the time the Conſtitution was under conſideration, with the explanation contained in the reſolution which he now ſupports.

A Member in the Convention having objected to the treaty-making power, as expreſſed in the Conſtitution, becauſe treaties became ſupreme laws of the land, *without the participation of Congreſs*, patriot Madiſon roſe and ſaid, "*Are not treaties the* "*law of the land in England?* I will refer you to "a book which is in every man's hand, Black-"ſtone's Commentaries. It will inform you, that "treaties, *made by the King*, are to be the ſupreme "laws of the land. *If they are to have any efficacy*, "*they muſt be laws of the land.* They are ſo *in every* "*country.*"

Now where has the patriot been ſince the time that he gave this explanation of the treaty-making power? What ſort of company muſt he have fallen into? I ſhould be very ſorry to ſuppoſe that he has drunk at the fountain that poiſoned his countryman Randolph; but really, ſuch a change of ſentiment, ſuch directly contradictory explanation of the very ſame clauſe, is hard to be accounted for.

In this debate on the call for the papers, which was, in fact, a debate on the treaty-making power, the patriot was ſeveral times called on for an explanation of his doctrine advanced in the Convention. He had the prudence to avoid an anſwer at that time, and to reſerve himſelf for the diſcuſſion of the preſent reſolution. He tells us here, that, upon *his honour*, he has *forgotten* what paſſed in the Conven-

tion; but that, however *reſpectable* ſuch authorities may be, the Conſtitution muſt now *explain itſelf*.—And ſo, Sir, you have *forgotten*, have you? forgotten all about it? The waters of Virginia, where you have undergone your political baptiſm, and where you have emerged a new man, are, I ſuppoſe, like thoſe of Lethe.

But though Mr. Madiſon had been dipped in the pool of oblivion, ſome other members of the Houſe had not; and as they made ſo preſſing a call on him for the explanation, he was obliged to ſay ſomething. It was not certainly a very ſatisfactory anſwer, to ſay that, however *reſpectable* ſuch authorities might be, the Conſtitution muſt now *explain itſelf*. As to the *reſpectability* of the authority, as far as relates to himſelf, I am ready to give that up; but how the Conſtitution is to explain itſelf, when he has found out five different conſtructions of the ſame clauſe, I cannot perceive. If it be true, that he penned the Conſtitution, I hope he will not boaſt of his work, unleſs, indeed, which is not impoſſible, he wiſhed it to anſwer all the convenient purpoſes of a Jeſuit's creed.

The Preſident, in his meſſage, tells the Houſe, that the treaty-making power has been thus underſtood by both parties in the negotiations with foreign powers. "It is thus," ſays he, "that the treaty-making power has been underſtood by foreign nations; and in all treaties made with them, *we* have declared, and *they* have believed, that, when ratified by the Preſident, with the advice and conſent of the Senate, they became obligatory." To this Mr. Madiſon replies: "By *we* was to be underſtood the Executive alone, and not the Houſe of Repreſentatives." Again he obſerves that "this was the firſt treaty made with a *foreign* power, ſince the operation of the preſent Government, "and

" and that therefore precedents muſt loſe much of " their weight."

What the patriot means by a *foreign* power, I know not: it is more than probable that, in his ample budget of conſtructions, he may have a dozen or two ready to be applied to his word *foreign*; but, according to my ſimple conception of the meaning of this epithet, it is applicable to every power with whom the United States have made, or can make, treaties; and of courſe, it ought to be applied to the Indian as well as to the European nations. The continental powers of Europe are all ſituated on the ſame land; ſome of them muſt neceſſarily be divided by landmarks, as we are from the Indians; yet they treat each other as *foreign* powers. If the word *foreign* is to be applied to no nation ſituated on the ſame land with ourſelves, it is yet to be proved, whether it ought to be applied to France and Spain, or not. Indeed it is likely that the patriot means to confine the word *foreign* to the Britiſh nation, as the only one which is divided from us by the ſea; if ſo, and if he ſhould be able to perſuade us that his *conſtruction* is a good one, we may then allow that this treaty is the firſt which the Federal Government has formed with foreign powers; but till he can do this, I, for my part, muſt continue to look upon the treaties made with the Indians as made with foreign powers.

If then it be true, and true it moſt aſſuredly is, that the treaties made with the Indians bear in themſelves the full force of the principle laid down by the Preſident; that, " when ratified by the Preſident " and Senate, they become obligatory;" how happens it that no objection was ever yet made to their contents in that reſpect? Foreign nations have ſeen thoſe treaties go quietly into effect, without waiting for the ſanction of the Houſe of Repreſentatives; and this, of itſelf, was a declaration of the whole nation,

nation, that no ſuch ſanction was neceſſary. But, ſays the patriot, " the Houſe of Repreſentatives " never made any ſuch declaration;" and for this very reaſon; becauſe no ſuch declaration was wanted. The Preſident and Senate ratified the treaties, and nobody diſputed their authority ſo to do; the unmaking power of the Houſe was reſerved to be exerciſed on the preſent occaſion.

Had the Houſe of Repreſentatives poſſeſſed the power of ſetting a treaty aſide, or rather, as they now contend, of giving it a final ratification, they ſhould have come forward and declared ſo, when the firſt treaty made under the preſent Government was laid before them. This would have been candidly telling other powers not to look upon a treaty as finally ratified by the United States, till it had been approved of by the Houſe; and, in the preſent inſtance, the King of Great Britain would not have been deceived into a ratification on his part, till ſuch approbation had been obtained.

Taking leave of the tergiverſation of patriot Madiſon, I ſhall add a few ſhort remarks on the reſolution itſelf.

One of its greateſt faults is, its unneceſſary length; it is however, like all the other propoſitions brought forward by the Oppoſition, calculated to deceive the multitude, and rally them under the banners of an intereſted, and perhaps corrupted faction, under the pretext of ſupporting their rights. The plain meaning of it is this: *The Preſident and Senate have a right to* make *treaties, and the Houſe of Repreſentatives to* unmake *them*; and Mr. Blount, if he had had as much courage as malice, would have couched it in theſe very words.

" When a treaty," ſays the reſolution, " ſtipu-
" lates regulations on any ſubject ſubmitted by the
" Conſtitution to the power of Congreſs, it muſt
" depend for its execution on Congreſs," and conſequently

ſequently on the Houſe of Repreſentatives. Several regulations are ſubmitted to the power of Congreſs: I ſhall confine myſelf to one only, as ſufficient to demonſtrate the conſequences of the doctrine here held up. "Congreſs," ſays the Conſtitution, "is "empowered *to regulate commerce with foreign na-* "*tions.*" Now what treaty, let me aſk, can the United States make with any nation on earth, *not containing ſtipulations on commerce?* What treaty can be formed with Great Britain, with Spain, with the Algerines, or even with the Indians, that does not contain ſtipulations of this kind? There are treaties with them all now before the Houſe, and they all do contain ſuch ſtipulations. It follows, of courſe, that the Preſident and Senate can make no treaty, that can be carried into execution without the conſent or ratification of the Houſe of Repreſentatives.

Yes, there are treaties of alliance offenſive or defenſive, or both, which may not contain ſtipulations on commerce; but then, the Congreſs has the power to declare war: and as theſe are certainly warlike regulations, the Houſe of Repreſentatives will undoubtedly claim a participation in making them, or at leaſt in unmaking them, according to the ſpirit of the reſolution. So that the Preſident and Senate's treaty-making power is, in fact, no power at all. It is a mere form of words; a deception thrown out to give foreign nations a belief of the ſtability and promptitude of this Government, in order to lure them into *conceſſions*, while the *real* power is reſerved, for annulling ſuch treaties as fall ſhort of the exorbitant pretenſions, or militate againſt the intereſted views, of theſe States.

If a vote of the Houſe of Repreſentatives be neceſſary to the *ratification* of a treaty (I ſay ratification, becauſe that ACT alone is worthy of the name, which gives full and complete effect to a treaty); if, then,

then, a vote of this Houſe be neceſſary to ſuch ratification, it ſhould be obtained *before* the ratification is diſpatched to a foreign Court. Any other manner of proceeding is mere duplicity. What ſays the treaty before us? "This treaty, when the ſame ſhall "have been ratified by his Majeſty, and by the "Preſident of the United States, by and with the "advice and conſent of their Senate, and the re-"ſpective ratifications mutually exchanged, ſhall "be binding and obligatory on his Majeſty, and "on the ſaid States, &c." Now, this has been done; the treaty has been ratified by his Majeſty and by the Preſident, with the conſent of the Senate; and yet the Houſe of Repreſentatives pretend, that it is *not* binding on theſe States, without *their conſent* alſo. Is this duplicity, or is it ſomething worſe?

Suppoſe the poſts, which are, in fulfilment of this treaty, to be delivered up to the United States, were ſituated in ſome part of Europe, where no intelligence of this reſolution could be obtained in due time to prevent the delivery; or ſuppoſe the treaty had ſtipulated for the weſtern poſts being given up in the month of December laſt. Had either of theſe been the caſe, Great Britain would have fulfilled her engagement, in this reſpect, while the United States are debating with themſelves *whether they ſhall fulfil theirs or not.* What ſort of national faith is this? To make uſe of the words of Mr. Giles reſpecting the land-jobbers, this is *ſwindling upon a broad ſcale*, indeed.

This reſolution, whatever may be the fate of the Britiſh treaty, will have the moſt pernicious effects on the relations of the United States with foreign nations. If the Miniſters of any power can be ſuppoſed to underſtand this Conſtitution, it muſt be thoſe of Great Britain. We ſee that they have underſtood it as giving the ſole power of making and

and ratifying treaties to the Prefident and Senate; and it is certain that other powers have, till now, underftood it in the fame way. But the refolution of *patriot* Blount is well calculated to undeceive them. All nations will now fay, 'Yes, the Americans have a Prefident and Senate, whom they 'hold forth to us as officers empowered to make 'treaties with us, and to give fuch treaties their 'full effect, as "fupreme laws of their land;" but 'we now perceive that this is all deception; thefe 'officers are only authorized to make and ratify '*fham* treaties with us; if they obtain their wifhes, 'they confirm thefe treaties afterwards; but if not, 'they referve to themfelves the power of fetting 'them afide.' In future, therefore, we muft naturally expect, that no power on earth, except, perhaps, a humiliated King of Spain, or a ftupid Indian Chief, will ever look upon a treaty with us as legally ratified, till it has received the fanction of the Houfe of Repreſentatives; nay, were I a Prince, I would not ratify, till the treaty had been ſigned by every individual Member of the ſovereign people; for, as *patriot* Madifon judicioufly obſerved, "there "is a *provident* article in the Conſtitution itſelf, by "which an avenue is always left open to the *ſove-* "*reign people* for *explanations or amendments*, as they "may be found indiſpenſable."

Here I ſhall be told, that the Britiſh Houſe of Commons poſſeſſes the ſame power, with reſpect to treaties, as is contended for by the Houſe of Repreſentatives; and yet that does not prevent other nations from treating with the King of Great Britain. If any inconſiſtency on the part of the Oppoſition could at this day excite ſurpriſe, it would be their having held up the practices of Great Britain as proper for their imitation. What! theſe very men, whoſe continual theme has been the execrating of the practices of that nation, now fly to it for precedents!

dents! The firſt writer that appeared in oppoſition to the Britiſh treaty, repreſented it as dangerous, becauſe it would "tend to the introduction of the "faſhions, forms, and *precedents* of a monarchy!" *Mr. Giles* ſaid, in the debate concerning Randall, that "he ſhould be *ſorry* to ſee *this Houſe* adopt *pre-* "*cedents* from the Britiſh Houſe of Commons!" Several times during this very debate, it was averred that the Conſtitution of Great Britain was juſt crumbling to pieces; and it is no longer ago than laſt year, that the ſagacious *patriot* Madiſon foretold, that he ſhould ſoon ſee the Peers of Great Britain coming to aſk a lodging from him. Mr. Swanwick, in the debates on the frigates, ſaid that Great Britain was on the verge of ruin. Another of theſe oppoſers declared ſhe was at her laſt gaſp. And theſe are the men, who now tell us that imitating Great Britain is the only way of preſerving the liberties of the people; while they ſeize every opportunity moſt ſlanderouſly to repreſent the people of that country as ſlaves.

But what are theſe precedents which they have taken from the Conſtitution of Great Britain? They tell us that the Houſe of Commons claim a right to withhold the ſupplies neceſſary to carry a treaty into effect. They claim this right with reſpect to all ſupplies; but, were they ever known to exerciſe it ſince the reign of the profligate frenchified Charles? At leaſt, were they ever known to exerciſe it for the purpoſe of violating a treaty made with a foreign power? I defy theſe gentlemen to prove any ſuch thing; and even if they could prove it, I would be very glad to know how the precedent will apply to themſelves. The Britiſh Conſtitution, happily for the people of that country, is not written in a book; is not reduced to a few clauſes, each of which admits of *five conſtructions*. There

There is no positive law that says to the House of Commons, 'You shall have no deliberative voice on 'the expediency or inexpediency of treaties.' This is not necessary in a Government like that of Great Britain. The organization of the House of Commons is itself a guarantee for their doing nothing that may endanger the honour or safety of the State. The electors there are few; the members are the representatives of property, and not of numbers. They are elected for seven years, and not for two. They are independent of the mob—a much better security for the State, than their being independent of those who sit at the helm of affairs. There is not, I am persuaded, a man in that House, who could, under any circumstances, bring himself to avow openly, that "he *adored* the voice of the "people," as Mr. Giles did in the debate on the call for papers. There is not the most distant resemblance between the House of Commons and the House of Representatives; and therefore the citing of precedents from the records of each other must be totally inadmissible. In one particular, however, I am willing to allow that the House of Representatives would do well in imitating the House of Commons; and here I believe I shall be seconded by every honest man in the Union; I mean in making provision for carrying the present treaty into effect.

In the Philadelphia Gazette of last year I find the following words made use of by Mr. Giles in the debate on the allowances to members of Congress: "Mr. Giles said, there was a country from which "America had *copied* a great deal *too much*. The "members of the British House of Commons re- "ceived no wages, while the officers of State had "immense salaries. It was, however, *understood*, "that the British House of Commons were very "well

" *well paid.* Mr. Giles did not wiſh to ſee *ſcenes* " of that kind *in this country.*"

Now, would it, I wonder, be permitted me to aſk this talkative Gentleman, what he meant by " ſcenes ?" If this were permitted, I would go on, and aſk him what he meant by *copying too much* from Great Britain ? If he himſelf be a copy of ſome original from that country, which I believe to be the caſe, in this inſtance I ſhall not contend that we have not copied too much ; but as to wages to members of Congreſs, I think we have not copied quite enough, witneſs a ſeſſion ſpun out to the month of May, and nothing done. Again, I would aſk him, how he came to *underſtand*, that the members of the Britiſh Houſe of Commons were very *well paid*, or, in other words, *corrupted by the King ?* He knows how ſeverely I could retort upon him here ; how I could dare him to a compariſon ; but I forbear, and return to the ſentence of this extract which ſo immediately applies to the ſubject before us.

It is well known that the members of the Houſe of Commons receive no ſtipend for their ſervices in that capacity ; therefore, when the propoſal before the Houſe was to draw money out of the pockets of the people to pay Mr. Giles and his colleagues ſuch a ſtipend, he thought America ſhould not copy from Great Britain. Imitating the Houſe of Commons in this inſtance, would have deprived the Gentleman of what he probably " *adored*" as much as he does " the voice of the people," and, perhaps, a great deal more. The Houſe of Commons was therefore thrown aſide as totally unworthy of imitation ; but when ſomething from the records of that Houſe ſeemed to ſtrengthen the arguments of Mr. Giles for ſetting aſide the treaty, then it was not wrong to copy from it : it was to be imitated as the only model ; as the only aſſembly in the world, that was the true repoſitory of the liberties of the people.—Theſe pal-

pable inconſiſtencies I leave Mr. Giles to reconcile, which I make no doubt he will be able to do, to the entire ſatisfaction of *his* conſtituents.

I ſhall now diſmiſs this reſolution of Citizen Blount, with obſerving, that if no treaty, *containing ſtipulations on commerce*, is finally ratified till ſanctioned by a vote of the Houſe of Repreſentatives, no treaty formed by the preſent Government is yet valid; for though that with Spain, for inſtance, has been ſanctioned by the Houſe, ſuch ſanction was not obtained prior to the ratification by the King of Spain. The ratification which that King now poſſeſſes is not valid, and therefore the treaty is not. This is clear and fair reaſoning, and I defy even patriot Madiſon, with his five conſtructions, to oppoſe it with ſucceſs. Is it aſſerted that the ratification now in the hands of the Court of Spain is binding on the United States? So, then, is the ratification now in the hands of his Britannic Majeſty; for they have both emanated from exactly the ſame powers. If the ratification exchanged with Great Britain be not final, be not obligatory, neither is that exchanged with Spain; the Kings of both nations have been duped; they have exchanged obligatory ratifications for ſuch as were not obligatory, and, of courſe, both the treaties become null and void: nor ſhould I ſcruple, were I the Miniſter of either of thoſe Princes, to adviſe an infraction of either treaty, when circumſtances might render it convenient; fully confident that this reſolution of the Houſe of Repreſentatives would juſtify the proceeding.

Reſolution for ſetting aſide the Britiſh Treaty.

April 14th.

Mr. HILLHOUSE (from *Connecticut*) having brought forward a reſolution for paſſing the laws neceſſary to carry the treaty into effect, Mr. Maclay

ſpoke againſt it, and concluded his ſpeech with the following preamble and reſolution :

" The Houſe having taken into conſideration the " treaty of amity, commerce, and navigation, be- " tween the United States and Great Britain, com- " municated by the Preſident in his meſſage of the " firſt day of March laſt, are of opinion, that it is, " in many reſpects, highly injurious to the intereſts " of the United States ; yet, *were they poſſeſſed of* " *any information which could juſtify the great ſacrifices* " contained in the treaty, their ſincere deſire to " cheriſh harmony and amicable intercourſe with " all nations, and their earneſt wiſh to co-operate " in haſtening to a final adjuſtment of the differ- " ences ſubſiſting between the United States and " Great Britain, might have induced them to wave " their objections to the treaty ; but, *when they con-* " *template the conduct of Great Britain in perſevering,* " *ſince the treaty was ſigned, in the impreſſment of* " *American ſeamen and the ſeizure of American veſſels* " *(laden with proviſions), contrary to the ſacred rights* " *of neutral nations* ; whether this be viewed as the " conſtruction meant to be given to any articles in " the treaty, or as contrary to and an infraction of " the true meaning and ſpirit thereof, the Houſe " cannot but regard it as incumbent on them, in " fidelity to the truſt repoſed in them, to forbear, " under ſuch circumſtances, taking at preſent any " active meaſures on the ſubject : therefore, *Reſolved,* " *that under the circumſtances aforeſaid, and with ſuch* " *information as the Houſe poſſeſs, it is not expedient,* " *at this time, to concur in paſſing the laws neceſſary* " *for carrying the ſaid treaty into effect.*"

Remarks.—The preamble to this reſolution holds out as an excuſe for withholding the ſupplies, that *the Houſe is not in poſſeſſion of any information to juſtify the great ſacrifices contained in the treaty.* What information could poſſibly render thoſe ſacrifices leſs than

than they are? How could the communication of the correſpondence between the Preſident and Mr. Jay alter the nature of ſacrifices contained in the treaty itſelf? If an infraction of this treaty ſhould take place on the part of Great Britain, to what ſhould we appeal? To the treaty itſelf, and not to the notes and converſations employed in the negotiation. The inſtrument itſelf is good or bad, and contains in itſelf full proofs of either; and if the Houſe have a right to decide on its merits, why not do it boldly? why not ſcorn this miſerable ſubterfuge?

"But," ſays the preamble, "when they contemplate the conduct of Great Britain ſince the treaty was ſigned, &c." Now, allowing all the falſehoods which have been circulated concerning impreſſments and ſeizures, to be undeniable truths, and that they are all contrary to the rights of neutral nations, what have they to do with laws neceſſary to carry the treaty into effect, or how can the papers of negotiation render them more or leſs injurious? If they are contrary to the rights of neutral nations or to the letter of the treaty, no papers whatever can juſtify them; if they are not, no papers can render them unjuſtifiable.

One ſentence in this preamble is ſingularly unfortunate: "*ſince* the treaty was *ſigned*." Obſerve here well, that an objection to giving the treaty its final ratification is founded on ſomething that Great Britain has done as an *infraction of it*. The Gentlemen have fairly tumbled into their own pit. According to the reſolution of Mr. Blount, now on the journals of the Houſe, the treaty is not a law of this land; it is not in force; it is not yet a treaty, and conſequently the Britiſh can be guilty of no infraction. Do the Oppoſition wiſh that this inſtrument ſhould be obligatory on Great Britain, from the moment of the ſigning of the ratifications as they now ſtand, and that it ſhould not even yet be obligatory on theſe

States? They may, probably, find powers to treat with them on this footing; a King of ſcalpers, the five Kings of France (barber Tom and his comrades four), or a degenerate ſcion of the ſtump of the Bourbons, may, perhaps, do it; but the King of Great Britain never will.

After theſe remarks on this hypocritical and abſurd preamble, I ſhall endeavour to point out the fatal conſequences that the adoption of the reſolution muſt be attended with, taking previouſly a view of the cauſes which have led to the preſent oppoſition. If, in doing this, I make uſe of an undiſguiſed language, which, notwithſtanding the boaſted liberty of the preſs, is little cuſtomary in theſe States, I hope my liege lords, the ſovereign citizens, will not take offence, as I declare upon my honour, that my motive, and my only motive, is, to perſuade them to live in peace with the only power on earth that is capable of doing them an injury in war.

Among the cauſes of the oppoſition to the treaty, the ſtipulation for an honourable diſcharge of the debts due from the ſouthern States (*Virginia* in particular) to the merchants of Great Britain certainly claims the firſt place. Theſe debts, due before the American war, were, according to the treaty of peace, to be honourably diſcharged; or, at leaſt, no law was to be paſſed, or to remain in force, which might operate as an impediment to their recovery. Here is the article of the treaty: "*Art.* IV. It is "agreed, that creditors on either ſide *ſhall meet with* "*no lawful impediment* to the recovery of the full "value, in ſterling money, of all *bona fide* debts "heretofore contracted."

Notwithſtanding this, in defiance of the General Government, and regardleſs of the national faith, thus ſolemnly pledged, the State of Virginia in particular has enacted, or kept in force, ſuch laws as are an impediment to the recovery of theſe debts. In conſequence

conſequence of this violation of the treaty of peace, and as a protection due from Great Britain to her merchants, ſhe kept poſſeſſion of the weſtern poſts, in order to oblige the United States to a fulfilment of their engagements. The *debtor* State or States have continued their diſhonourable laws in force to this day; and for this reaſon it is, that to this day Great Britain keeps the forts in her poſſeſſion.

When a new treaty between the two nations was to be made, the relinquiſhment of the poſts was the firſt object on the part of Great Britain, and accordingly the treaty ſets out with a ſtipulation for their being given up *on the 1ſt day of June* 1796, five weeks from this day. But on the other hand, the United States ſtipulate to pay, or cauſe to be paid, the above-mentioned debts, the recovery of which has been hitherto unjuſtly impeded, by acts which the Virginians have the impudence to dignify with the name of laws.

It was not to be ſuppoſed that Virginia would not oppoſe this arrangement. Both her Senators ſtepped forward againſt the treaty. One of them, Mr. Maſon, divulged its contents prematurely. It was printed without the permiſſion of the executive power; agents were diſpatched with it to every part of the Union, with inſtructions to miſrepreſent its meaning, and to ſtir up ſuch an oppoſition as might deter the Preſident from a ratification. The following advertiſement will fully ſhow the temper of that State at the time.

" *Richmond (Capital of Virginia).*

" *Notice is hereby given,*

" That in caſe the treaty entered into by that d—d " arch traitor J—n J—y with the *Britiſh Tyrant* " ſhould be ratified, a petition will be preſented to " the next general Aſſembly of Virginia at their " next ſeſſion, praying that the ſaid State may *re-* " *cede from the Union*, and be left under the govern-

" ment and protection of one hundred thousand " free and independent Virginians.

" P. S. As it is the wish of the people of the said " State to enter into a *treaty of amity, commerce*, and " *navigation*, with any other State or States of the " present Union, who are averse to returning again " under the galling yoke of Great Britain, the " Printers of the *(at present)* United States are re- " quested to publish the above notification."

" *Richmond, July 30th*, 1795.

I must beg to be excused for stepping aside from my subject a minute, in order to make a few observations of a more general nature, on the conduct of this turbulent, and I may say rebellious State. One of her Representatives in Congress, Mr. Giles, said, " that he hoped Virginia would pursue uniformly " the line of conduct that had ever marked her po- " litical character. Her conduct, he observed, had " been uniform from the beginning of the revolu- " tion to the present day; uniform and exemplary " in her *obedience to the laws*, &c. He prided him- " self in representing such a State." About a *twentieth part* of such a State the Gentleman meant, without doubt; that is, if he did not for the moment mean to give up his title of " *immediate* Represent- " ative."

Indeed, as Mr. Giles observed, the conduct of his State has been uniform, if a continual disaffection to the Government of the United States, sometimes concealed under the mask of hypocrisy and base crawling flattery, and sometimes breaking out in open opposition; if this be a uniform conduct, her conduct has been uniform. The reader must have remarked the words " *British Tyrant*," in the above advertisement, and he must also know that to abuse and vilify that Monarch is the favourite theme of Virginians. Now to give him a pretty correct idea of the uniformity of their political conduct, I shall here insert

inſert an extract from the American Magazine for September, 1769: "We your Majeſty's *moſt loyal*, "*dutiful*, and *affectionate ſubjects*, of your Majeſty's "ancient colony of Virginia, beg leave in the "*humbleſt manner* to aſſure your Majeſty, that your "faithful ſubjects of this colony, ever diſtinguiſhed "by their loyalty, and firm attachment to your "Majeſty and your royal anceſtors, &c. &c. We "are *ready to ſacrifice our lives and fortunes* in defence "of your Majeſty's *ſacred* perſon and Government. "It is with the deepeſt concern and moſt *heart-felt* "*grief* that your Majeſty's dutiful ſubjects of this "colony find that their loyalty hath been *traduced*, "and that thoſe meaſures which a juſt regard for "the *Britiſh Conſtitution (dearer to them than life)* "made neceſſary duties, have been miſrepreſented "as rebellious attacks on your Majeſty's Govern-"ment.—After expreſſing our confidence in your "royal *wiſdom* and *goodneſs*, permit us to aſſure "your Majeſty, that the moſt fervent prayers of "your people of this colony are *daily addreſſed to the* "*Almighty*, that your Majeſty's reign may be long "and proſperous over Great Britain and all your "dominions; and that, after death, your Majeſty "may taſte the fulleſt fruition of eternal bliſs, and "that a deſcendant of your illuſtrious Houſe may "reign over the extended Britiſh empire *until time* "*ſhall be no more.*"—AMEN!

The man whoſe *ſacred* perſon they were ready to ſacrifice life and fortune in defence of, is now called the "*Britiſh Tyrant*;" and "*the Britiſh Conſtitution*, "*dearer to them than life*," is now "*the galling* "*yoke of Great Britain!*" Poor bankrupt devils! the King of Great Britain ſtands in no need of their lives and fortunes, nor of their prayers daily addreſſed to the Almighty. Neither do their curſes affect him a bit more than thoſe of the French atheiſts. I dare ſay, if the truth were known, that he does not think

half ſo much about the "ancient and dutiful and "loyal and pious State of Virginia" as he does about the kennel of his ſtag-hounds.

Another trait of the uniformity of conduct in this State is exhibited in her behaviour to the Preſident of the United States. After his election, he received the firſt addreſs from the Virginians. I can ſay nothing better nor worſe of this addreſs, than that it was full as dutiful, affectionate, and *ſincere*, as the addreſs to the King. Let any man compare that addreſs with the inſults that this inſolent State, and her members in Congreſs, have heaped on the Preſident during the laſt nine months, and then doubt of the uniformity of the conduct of Virginia if he can.

But Mr. Giles ſays, "Virginia has been uniform "and exemplary in her *obedience to the laws*." I ſhall mention but two inſtances of this. The firſt is, her having abſolutely diſobeyed the treaty of peace, by making, or keeping in force, acts which have hitherto prevented the fulfilment of that treaty, and which had nearly plunged the Union into a war. The ſecond inſtance is, her having attempted, during this very ſeſſion of Congreſs, to raiſe up an oppoſition to the Government in every State in the Union, and even to deſtroy the Conſtitution. If theſe inſtances of her "*obedience to the laws*" were not ſufficient, one might add her inſtructions to all her Repreſentatives to oppoſe the execution of the Britiſh treaty, "a ſupreme law of the land." Such are the proofs which Mr. Giles might have cited of her "uniform and *exemplary* obedience to the laws."

Mr. Giles may "pride himſelf in being a Repre-"ſentative from ſuch a State;" but I believe that few men who do not *adore* "the voice of the "people," will envy him his poſt.

Who did not expect that every member from this State would do his utmoſt to ſet the treaty aſide? The final determination of the Houſe of Repreſentatives

atives is not yet known; but I do not ſcruple to declare all thoſe enemies of the treaty, who voted in favour of Mr. Blount's reſolution; and it is well known that every member from Virginia is included in that number. Had the treaty been oppoſed from any other motive than the one I contend for, ſurely out of eighteen members, ſome one would have been found not included in the Oppoſition.

If there are any particular members among thoſe now leagued againſt the Conſtitution, who claim the guilty pre-eminence, it muſt be thoſe who are actuated by this ſelfiſh, this diſgraceful motive. It is a truth, and a truth that will be a laſting ſtigma on the American character, that if this treaty be rendered null, it will be for no other reaſon than *becauſe it engages for a diſcharge of juſt debts*, on the part of Americans.

I am far from wiſhing to inſinuate, that there are no honourable exceptions to be found among the people of Virginia; a recent attempt in their legiſlature to ſubject lands to ſeizure for the payment of debts, is a full proof that ſuch exceptions do exiſt: but in ſpeaking of a State, we muſt ſpeak of it as one; our opinions muſt be founded on the meaſures it adopts, whether ſuch meaſures may be the effect of the unanimous voice of the people, or not. In like manner foreign nations muſt judge of the United States. If they fail in the fulfilment of their engagements, if the ſwindling propoſitions for annulling the treaty ſhould finally ſucceed, foreign nations will pronounce on the meaſure itſelf, without paying any attention to our internal diſputes and diviſions. The minority will be lumped with the majority; the everlaſting ſtain will imprint itſelf on the whole American people, not excepting the hitherto ſpotleſs character of a Waſhington.

French influence is another ſource of oppoſition to the treaty. Thoſe who have read Mr. Randolph's Vindication,

Vindication, as it was ironically called, have ſeen how narrowly the Preſident eſcaped from the plots of that Gentleman; what overtures were made to the French Miniſter for "ſome thouſands of dollars." They will ſee how that "pretended patriot" laboured to protract the ratification; how well his plans were laid for embroiling this country with Great Britain, and how all his meaſures were taken for ſubjecting the Government of this country to France. I do not ſay that any of the members who now oppoſe the Government and the treaty, are abſolutely in the pay of the five Kings; but after reviewing the inſidious conduct of the Secretary of State, after having duly conſidered the rank of the perſons on whoſe behalf, as well as his own, certain overtures were made; after having ſeen ſome of the men now in Congreſs, particularly *an inconſiſtent leader*, named as a confidential friend of *Citizen Fauchet*, I muſt be excuſed if I have my doubts. Doubts I ſhall have till I ſee thoſe who now oppoſe the treaty, ceaſe their eulogiums, their fulſome and nauſeous eulogiums of a people, who, in their preſent ſtate, are not entitled even to pity.

What influence the French have had among the multitude will appear from two circumſtances (I could mention a thouſand) freſh in every one's mind. At the town-meeting at New-York, called to condemn the treaty, the people marched under the banners of France and America. Theſe flags were carried at the head of the vile and inſolent proceſſion that proceeded to the Governor's houſe, and there burnt the treaty. The other fact is of ſtill more recent date, and ſtill more ſtriking. The petition, ſaid to be ſigned by fifteen hundred *citizens* of Philadelphia, againſt the treaty, and now before the Houſe, was carried round for ſignature by a *Frenchman*. The *chairman* of the meeting was alſo a *Frenchman*; nor am I ſure that it was not originally

ginally drawn up in the *French language*. I wonder what the people of England, or, indeed, of any independent nation, would ſay to a foreigner, who ſhould carry round for their ſignature a petition againſt the execution of a "law of the land;" a ſolemn contract entered into between them and another nation? There is a certain point of debaſement, below which no nation can ſink: whether this be that point, or not, I will not at preſent take upon me to ſay: God only knows what he has yet in reſerve for us.

I am aware, it will be ſaid here, that, though the chairman, under whoſe authority and direction this petition was drawn up, was a *Frenchman*, yet it was preſented to the Houſe by an *Engliſhman*, or, to ſpeak more correctly, an *homuncio*, born in England. But let it be recollected that this *homuncio* has, ſince the beginning of the preſent war, been a moſt deſperate ſupporter of the cauſe of the French; that he trades to France, and to France principally, and that the whole of his political career juſtifies the name of *Engliſh Jacobin*.

The reader, from what has been ſaid of this diminutive mortal, will at once perceive that I am ſpeaking of *Mr. Swanwick*, one of the auguſt Repreſentatives of the city of Philadelphia. I have been told that this gentleman has taken upon him to pronounce me a hired *Engliſh ſcribbler*. I will not tell this *omiciuolo* (for the *Italian* diminutive ſuits him beſt on every account) what I am; but I will tell him what I am not. I am not deſcended from the dregs of the King of Great Britain's Cuſtom-houſe; I was never fed from the ſcraps of his Majeſty's bounty, collected by an honeſt ſpy, called *a Tide-waiter*. I never ſnapped at the hand that gave me bread, and nouriſhed the ſtreams from which I drew my life. I am the baſe and cringing flatterer of no man, much leſs of the men I deſpiſe. I never wrote to England

an enumeration of my *titles*, outnumbering thoſe of a Spaniſh Hidalgo, and concluding with, "the Pre-"ſident of the Emigration Society, Treaſurer of the "Dancing Aſſembly, and Truſtee of the Young "Ladies School." At the age of *thirty-eight*, in the prime of life, I never decorated my bed-chamber with laſcivious pictures, *Leda and her Swan*, and ſuch-like ſtimuluſes. One who is obliged to have recourſe to theſe miſerable ſhifts is unworthy even of the name *omicciuolo*.

After having thus candidly given an account of myſelf, let me aſk you, *Mr. Swanwick*, a queſtion or two. How came you to imagine yourſelf bleſſed with the *aura divina?* How came you to imagine that the *Muſes*, who are of the female ſex, had ever caſt a favourable eye on you? Beſides, if you muſt commit your miſerable doggrel to paper, why ſend it to England for impreſſion? Why take ſuch incredible pains to enſure its appearance in an Engliſh Magazine? Why did you not ſend it to your new country France? Can it be poſſible that you yet wiſh to ſhine among the countrymen of your anceſtors? I will wear the ſhine off you, as ſure as you and I live. As to the piece I here allude to, I have not room at preſent to lay it before my readers; but I will juſt aſk, how you came to diſcover that *earth* is to *become* the *prototype of heaven*—

> "So ſhall the year to harmony be given,
> "And *earth be found the prototype of heaven.*"

Let the year be *given to harmony* as much as you pleaſe, ſet all your veſtals to chanting, and rock us to ſleep with your own *canzones*, yet I preſume it will never be found that earth is the *prototype* of heaven; the *prototype* of ſomething that exiſted *before it*, and which it is to *reſemble*. As ſoon as there is a vacancy in your young Ladies academy, I adviſe you to fill it yourſelf, and to let poetry and politics alone.

It is juſt matter of ſurpriſe that this Gentleman ſhould be elected the Repreſentative of ſuch a city as Philadelphia. The arts by which his election was brought about I reſerve as the ſubject of an article in a future Cenſor. I have heard of a ſturdy young Lord in England, who got himſelf elected through the intereſt of the wives and daughters of his conſtituents; Mr. Swanwick will never be ſuſpected of *this kind of corruption*; but whether he ought to be ſuſpected of no other kind, is more than I will pretend to determine. Grog is cheap, and its influence is mighty.

After this long and rambling digreſſion, I return to the ſubject of French influence; and I am perſuaded that the reader muſt agree with me, that, after the Virginia debts, it has been the principal cauſe of oppoſition to the Britiſh treaty.

However, it muſt be confeſſed that theſe cauſes, powerful as they have been, would have produced but a partial effect, had they not been aided by the deluſion of the great body of the people with reſpect to the ſituation of Great Britain. The rancour they entertained againſt that nation laid them open to the falſehoods which the friends of France, among whom we may reckon nearly all the news-printers, ſo induſtriouſly ſpread through the country. A hundred times Great Britain has been repreſented as on the brink of ruin. The Editor of the Philadelphia Gazette opened the new year, 1795, with congratulating his cuſtomers on the ſtability and vigour of the Federal Government, while that of Great Britain was juſt crumbling to pieces. In the ſame paper, he called the iſland of Britain "*an inſular Baſtile.*"—When intelligence was received of the progreſs the French were making in Holland, the papers announced it as an event that muſt neceſſarily be the immediate cauſe of the total overthrow of the Britiſh nation. "The taking of Amſterdam," ſaid the papers,

pers, "is the laſt blow to the power of Britain." Bets were laid that Great Britain would become an appendage of the French Republic; and more than once were we informed by the public papers, that the tri-coloured flag was flying on St. James's palace.

Groſs as theſe impoſitions were, they were greedily ſwallowed by the people, nine tenths of whom believed every aſſertion of the kind that was made. Men are apt to believe what they wiſh; it is hard to convince them, that thoſe whom they hate are objects of envy and reſpect. Such was the general opinion of the diſtreſſes and weakneſs of Great Britain, and ſuch the perſuaſion that her ſituation would oblige her to yield to any thing that Mr. Jay ſhould dictate, that when intelligence was received of the concluſion of the treaty, *Pichegru* was toaſted as the *negotiator*.

A circumſtance like this, though deſpicable in itſelf, proves that an opinion was entertained that his Britannic Majeſty had been *forced* by the ſucceſſes of the French, to accept of ſuch terms as Mr. Jay choſe to offer; and, of courſe, a treaty was expected, at once humiliating to Great Britain, and honourable as well as advantageous to the United States. Nothing equal to theſe lofty expectations was to be found in the treaty. It was a diſappointment; and diſappointment ever diſpoſes men to diſcontent. In vain were the people told that they had been deceived with reſpect to the ſtate of Great Britain: in vain was it hinted to them, that ſhe would finally be ſucceſsful in the war: their hatred and the continued chain of falſehood running through the public papers, had rendered them deaf to the voice of reaſon and of truth. The ſouthern debtors and French emiſſaries took advantage of this prevalent deluſion, and the oppoſition became almoſt univerſal.

There were not wanting men of talents to add fuel

fuel to the flame; nor were there wanting others, actuated by a ſincere love of their country, who endeavoured to counteract ſuch baleful efforts. It is certainly owing to the writings of theſe Gentlemen, that the people have latterly begun to form a right judgment of this important treaty, and to rally round that Government on which their very exiſtence as an independent nation depends. The Judges too, in the middle and northern States, have exerted a laudable zeal; ſome of the public papers have ſtood forth in the cauſe of order and truth; and there is not the leaſt doubt that the treaty would have met with no oppoſition in the Houſe of Repreſentatives, had not the members been choſen while the public mind was at the height of its fermentation. This was unfortunately the caſe; *treaty* and *no treaty*, were the ſignals at the elections; and as the oppoſers were the moſt numerous, ſo are the members of the Oppoſition.

Thus is this oppoſition bottomed on *diſhoneſty*, *corruption*, or *ignorance*, and probably on all three together. That it may be fruſtrated, is my ſincere wiſh; and that it will, I have not the leaſt doubt. I cannot bring myſelf to imagine that the people of this country will tamely ſuffer themſelves to be hurled from the pinnacle of national proſperity, into the horrid abyſs of foreign and civil war, of anarchy, requiſitions, and maſſacre, by a band of intereſted and deſperate leaders, who have nothing to loſe but the poſts which their too credulous conſtituents have beſtowed on them. I have not the leaſt doubt that the nefarious conſpiration will be finally rendered abortive, and that the French gold, now in circulation, will be as ineffectual as that formerly diſtributed among the "pretended patriots of America;" but while there is a poſſibility of the contrary, the attention of the people ought to be directed to the dangers that await them.

I ſhall

I ſhall point out theſe dangers as they preſent themſelves to me: if the reader ſhould think them imaginary, he may do well to treat them like other efforts of imagination; but if he has the leaſt reaſon to think them real, it is certainly his duty to endeavour to avert them by every exertion in his power.

The firſt thing that preſents itſelf among the conſequences of annulling the treaty is, the detention of the weſtern poſts by the Britiſh. The not poſſeſſing of theſe poſts has latterly coſt the people of this country about a million of dollars annually, beſides the loſs of lives, beſides defeats and continual diſcontents. The poſſeſſion of them muſt then be a deſirable object. But, ſay the enemies of the treaty, they ought to have been given up long ago, unconditionally. I have proved the contrary, and I could repeat my proofs, but this is now totally out of the queſtion: we know they were not given up, that they are not yet given up, and we may be aſſured that they will not be given up, unleſs the preſent treaty is carried into effect.

But it is ſaid that the Britiſh are bound by the treaty to give up the poſts on the firſt of June, and that they ought to fulfil this part of their engagements without paying any attention to what is doing in Congreſs; that they have no buſineſs with our internal diſputes, the treaty being the only rule for their conduct; and, with this doctrine in hand, it is ſuppoſed that ſome members of the Houſe of Repreſentatives mean to delay their deciſion on the ſubject till after the firſt of June; and if the poſts are not evacuated at that time, to accuſe the Britiſh of annulling the treaty. To this I anſwer, that I am fully perſuaded that the Governor of Canada will retain the poſts, till the treaty has been ſanctioned by an appropriation law; and that I am fully convinced he would be juſtified in ſo doing. This

nation

nation formed a certain Conſtitution, or manner of government, which they promulgated to the world; in this Conſtitution it is ſaid, that treaties, made and ratified by the Preſident and Senate, *ſhall be ſupreme laws of the land.* Perſuaded that the nation would abide by this its ſolemn declaration, ſeveral powers made treaties with the Preſident and Senate, and among others, Great Britain; but before the time for fulfilling a certain ſtipulation in the treaty with Great Britain is arrived, it becomes matter of doubt, whether this treaty be valid or not; or rather, one branch of the American Government declares it invalid, by a reſolution entered on its journals. Under ſuch circumſtances, will common reaſon or common ſenſe deny, that the Britiſh would be juſtifiable in refuſing to fulfil their part of the ſtipulations?

I have ſaid, that Mr. Blount's reſolution declares the treaty *invalid.* The word invalid is not made uſe of, but we ſhall ſoon ſee that the reſolution goes to the full length. The Houſe, by adopting it, have formally and explicitly declared, that a treaty including commercial regulations, is not binding on the United States, till ſanctioned by the Houſe of Repreſentatives. The preſent treaty includes commercial regulations, and therefore is *not binding on the United States.* The Houſe have alſo declared in this reſolution, that treaties including commercial regulations require the ſanction of the Houſe of Repreſentatives before they can be effectual; or, in other words, that the ratification of the Preſident and Senate is *not ſufficient to give ſuch treaties their full and entire effect.* The preſent treaty was, then, concluded and ratified by perſons not fully empowered ſo to do.

Now, the firſt principles, touching treaties, are; that, to be valid, *the parties muſt have full power to conclude, ratify, and carry into effect*; and that

the covenant muſt be *equally binding and obligatory on both parties*. The Houſe of Repreſentatives have declared, that the preſent treaty fails in both theſe points; they declare it invalid, and the Britiſh will certainly be permitted to believe them. Upon this ground it is, that, ſhould the Governor of Canada deliver the poſts, before the Houſe has ſanctioned the treaty, he would deſerve to loſe his head.

I will juſt ſtop here to obſerve, that I dare ſay it never entered into the heads of the wiſe Oppoſition, that Billy Pitt may, perhaps, play them a trick. Suppoſe he could gull the *five* ſans-culotte Kings with Canada, in exchange for St. Domingo? the *poſts* would go into the bargain, of courſe, and then we ſhould have to diſpute with our own dear kindred republicans for them. Take care, Gentlemen; now or never is the time to have them, take my word for it.

The treaty being invalid, all the other ſtipulations as well as that reſpecting the poſts, will aſſuredly remain unfulfilled. The reviſal of the ſentences given in the courts of vice-admiralty, and the appointment of commiſſioners for examining appeals, &c. will not take place; the conſequence of which will be, the merchants of this country will loſe about five or ſix millions of dollars. Indeed, Mr. Livingſton, with a view of ſilencing theſe people, has brought forward a reſolution for paying theſe few millions out of the treaſury of the United States. All the difference in this caſe will be, that the loſs will be divided among us all; the hardworking peaſant and mechanic will be obliged to contribute towards an indemnification for a loſs incurred by adventurers and ſpeculators.

Things will remain, then, with reſpect to Great Britain, juſt as they were before Mr. Jay went to England; we muſt, therefore, bring ourſelves back to that epoch, and ſet out afreſh.

The

The ſame alternative preſents itſelf: a negotiation or war. The Preſident would prefer a negotiation; but can any one ſuppoſe that he will ever enter into another? I ſhall, however, for a moment, admit this to be poſſible. I ſhall ſuppoſe him content to give up his adherence to the Conſtitution, to receive his inſtructions from the Houſe of Repreſentatives, and to order his Envoy to confine himſelf within the bounds traced out by that Houſe. I ſhall ſuppoſe the Envoy arrived at the Court of St. James's; and, that all may be of a piece, I ſhall ſuppoſe this Envoy to be the immaculate Mr. *Gallatin.* If this reſpectable perſonage ſhould be admitted to an interview with Lord Grenville, of which I much doubt, the following dialogue would very probably take place.

Lord Grenville. Your moſt obedient, Sir. What may have procured us the honour of this Extraordinary Envoy from our very good friends the United States?

Mr. Gallatin. Vy, me Lort, de Citizens Sovereigns of my country dit ſend me to make a treaty vit you's King.

Lord Grenville (aſide). I wonder where the devil his country is?—Sir, I fear here is ſome miſtake. Pray, Sir, permit me to aſk, of what country you are a citizen?

Mr. Gallatin. I am porn Citizen of *Geneva, but—*

Lord Grenville (interrupting him). But now you are a Citizen of France, I ſuppoſe. It is my duty to inform you, Sir, that the King my maſter authorizes me to open no negotiation with any perſon acting under the direction of regicides and common ſtabbers. Here! Tom! ſhow this Citizen down ſtairs; and, do you hear! *don't let him come behind you.*

Tom (taking the Envoy by the ſhoulder). Come, come, go along, go along, my good fellow. I

wonder where the ſtupid porter was, that this ill-looking fellow got up ſtairs.

Mr. Gallatin (reſiſting). But, me Lort, hear me von vort. Though I vas porn Citizen Geneveſe, I am now Citizen American*; ant I am ſended to you's King py me Sovereigns, to make a treaty vit him. Here, me Lort, are me credentials (pulling out papers).

Lord Grenville. But, Sir, previous to examining your papers, may I beg to be informed, how it comes to paſs, that the Americans ſhould chooſe for the Repreſentative of their nation, or for a *Repreſentative of any kind*, a foreigner, and a foreigner too whoſe looks are not calculated to produce a prepoſſeſſion in his favour?

Mr. Gallatin. Bella di fuori, e dentro ha la magagna.

Lord Grenville. A proverb ill applied, Sir; for I believe that your inſide is as bad as your outſide. I do not believe that that inſurrection face of yours belies your heart.

Mr. Gallatin. Inſurrection! me Lort! vy it is de very firſt article in de *Rights of Man.* I have made von inſurrection in de mountains of Pennſylvene, dat is vy I am Repreſentative.

Lord Grenville. Upon my word it is a curious qualification. But let me caution you, Sir, unleſs you have a mind to take a trip to Botany Bay, not to

---

* *Mr. Gallatin* has, I am told, founded a new town in the Whiſky country, which he has named *New Geneva.* A fellow tranſported, ſome years ago, to a certain State not far from the *Potomac*, chriſtened his cabin, *New Newgate.* It was, I preſume, in imitation of this worthy *emigrant*, that our Italian gave the name of his little native *municipal jail* to an American town. I would adviſe him to ſuffer none but imported Savoyards (in French ſynonymous with *chimney-ſweeps*) to ſettle in it; and, then, as the ſaying is, he will have a little hell of his own.

attempt to exercife this article of your declaration of rights in this country. Your papers, Sir, if you pleafe.

Mr. Gallatin. Dere de are, me Lort, in de veritable revolutionary ſtyle.

Lord Grenville (reading).——" produced great " diſputes and diviſions——has been declared in- " valid——will not grant the ſums—into effect— " changed the Conſtitution——hopes that the mag- " nanimity of his Majeſty——wiſh to preſerve " peace and good underſtanding."

Mr. Gallatin. Yes, me Lort, vee viſhes to lif in de peas and goot underſtanding.

Lord Grenville. And ſo, Sir, you have changed your Conſtitution, and this is to render the treaty invalid on your part, but not on ours. What ſort of work is this ?

Mr. Gallatin. Vee Citizens call dis " *political* " *ſin*," me Lort.

Lord Grenville. It is a ſin, I believe, my friend, you will have to expiate yourſelves. Our auguſt Monarch will, undoubtedly, thank you for the high opinion you entertain of his magnanimity; but I am afraid you deceive yourſelves, if you imagine he will live in peace and good underſtanding with you upon your terms. As to a new treaty, we can make none with you; for, as a change in your Conſtitution has rendered one invalid, another change may render another invalid; and ſo, Sir, I heartily wiſh you a ſafe return over the Atlantic.

Mr. Gallatin. But, me Lort, hear me von oder vort.

Lord Grenville. Not one, upon my honour; I have heard you too long already. Beſides, we are buſy here ſettling the affairs of your friends the French. After that's done you may hear from us.— Tom, conduct the Citizen into the ſtreet.

Lord Grenville (ſolus). Can it be poſſible that the

Americans are ſo poor in talents, ſo debaſed in principle, as to intruſt their public affairs to an European adventurer, the leader of an inſurrection? Can theſe people be ſo degenerated? I bluſh to think them the offſpring of Britons. Bleſſed for ever be the laws of Old England, that exclude all foreigners from public offices. Theſe wretches are now tearing the Government of America to pieces, as the ſubtle and intriguing *Necker* did that of France. They join themſelves to the reſtleſs rabble of every country, flatter their paſſions and prejudices, make war upon the rich, divide the ſpoil, and then retire to their own country to devour it.

I do not pretend to ſay, that the interview would be conducted exactly thus; but I am certain as to its reſult. I am certain that every offer to treat would be rejected with diſdain. War then muſt be reſorted to; not that war is the neceſſary conſequence of the violation of a treaty; but with the accumulated load of griefs and inſults on both ſides, and the irreconcilable hatred exiſting in this country againſt Great Britain, it is morally impoſſible to preſerve peace.

The Preſident and Senate are oppoſed to war; they know well its conſequences to this country; but who can tell what the Preſident of next year may be? Can any man poſſibly hope, that General Waſhington will ſuffer himſelf to be degraded by remaining the pageant, the mere tool of a faithleſs and profligate faction? The reputation he has gained it is not in the power of hell to wreſt from him; hitherto he has been ſuffered to keep in the path of honour; but one ſingle ſtep in the direction he is now required to tread, and his renown is blaſted for ever. No; if this treaty does not go into effect, it cannot be expected, it cannot be hoped, that he will again accept the poſt of Preſident. Nor will any other man accept of it, who is attached to the preſent

preſent Conſtitution. Some more pliant mortal muſt then be found; ſome proſtituted friend of France, ready to ſacrifice the intereſts of this country to the wild and bloody principles of the Convention. With ſuch a Preſident, and with ſuch a majority in the Houſe of Repreſentatives, war with Britain would be inevitable.

War is at all times and to all countries dreadful in its effects, but to no country and at no time was it ever ſo dreadful as it would now be to America. This is not a warlike nation, nor has this nation a warlike Government. In a war with any nation whatever, this country can gain nothing, and in a war with Great Britain it has every thing to loſe.

When aſſertions like theſe are advanced, the advocates for war turn, with imaginary triumph, to the reſult of the laſt war. They tell us, that America was victorious, and that the country is now much more populous and rich than it was then.

In the firſt place, what did this country *gain* by the laſt war? If *independence* was a *gain* (for *at preſent* that is very problematical), it was the only gain. I ſhall not dwell on the *loſſes*. Thoſe who have had their houſes burnt about their ears; thoſe who have been pillaged, plundered, robbed of their property; thoſe who are now ſtarving with bundles of continental money under their roofs; thoſe who have loſt their children or their parents, do not need to be reminded of the loſſes of that war. If *independence* was the *only gain* of laſt war, what is to be the gain of another? The *warriors* do not pretend that we could go and take Great Britain; they do not pretend that we could take Jamaica; they do not pretend even that we could take Bermuda. What then can we take? Why—*Canada*. This is the burden of their ſong, or rather *war-whoop*. With this they divert the rabble, and ſharpen their fangs for war and conqueſt. If you aſk them *how* they would do

this, they tell you that *men* are not wanting; that *four hundred thousand* would turn out volunteers against Great Britain. I believe twice that number would turn out for a field-day, with sticks and staves, and return very peaceably home to supper; but would they do this two days running? If I am to judge from experience, from the infinite difficulty the Government had to assemble so trifling a force as fifteen thousand men on a recent occasion, I should reduce this army of four hundred thousand men to three or four battalions. I shall be told that the sentiments of the people concerning the *excise* were divided; and are they unanimous concerning the treaty? I will however suppose the people to have but one sentiment; I will suppose *one* hundred thousand men ready to submit themselves to all the rigour of military discipline, and all the hardships inseparable from actual service; I will suppose them all heroes, ready to "seek the bubble reputation in the "cannon's mouth;" and I will suppose a Washington at their head. Yet these heroes must eat, and must have some kind of covering too; and this will cost money. In short, I have made a little calculation of the expense of *fifty* thousand men, *ten* armed vessels, *ten* galleys, with all the necessary officers, horses, waggons, cannon, &c. &c. &c. and I find the amount to be above *twenty millions of dollars* annually, a sum three times as great as the *present* revenue of the United States. Can any sober man look at this, and imagine this country fit to engage in a war? There is not money in the treasury sufficient to carry on the war one month. As to loans, where are they to be obtained? In France or in Holland? The very mention of those countries, on such a subject, excites laughter. Domestic loans! who will lend a sixpence? Taxes! there will be nothing but houses and land to tax. Commerce will be no more. The enemy will let nothing out of

our

our ports, or into them. In a word, it is abſolutely impoſſible for this country to equip any thing like a creditable force, without having recourſe to a *paper currency and requiſitions*. I care not who differs from me in opinion; this opinion I give as my own, and, if war is declared, I ſhall ſee it verified.

As *doing injury to Great Britain* is the ſtrongeſt ſtimulus to war in this country, I ſhall now take a view of the extent of that injury in the preſent inſtance. As to the taking of Canada, I do not believe it probable. There are men in that country as well as in this; and they are better men, too, if we believe thoſe debaſed wretches, who tell us, that one Frenchman is worth three of their own anceſtors. At any rate they are men, they are at home, they have eight or nine regular regiments, and a train of artillery, ſuch as this country will not have in fifty years to come, engineers and other experienced officers. When the *warriors* talk about taking Canada, they forget that there is any body to defend it. To be ſure, the poor devils are *ſubjects*; but as they might get together twice the number of the *citizens* marched againſt them, there is a poſſibility at leaſt that they might lay ſome few of the latter dead upon the field.

By ſea, a war with this country would not add a dollar to the expenſes of Great Britain. She is already armed, and can very well ſpare a ſtout ſquadron for this coaſt. How this ſquadron *might be employed* I ſhall not point out; ſuffice it to ſay, that, if doing *injury* ſhould be the object of the Britiſh Court, more could be done to us in one week, than we could do to Great Britain in ten years.

But we ſhould ſtarve their iſlands: no ſuch thing. He who is maſter of the ſea, may call himſelf the maſter of the land. Thoſe who have produce to

ſell,

ſell, will ſell it, in ſpite of decrees and ordinances. The Britiſh would obtain all they wanted, juſt as they do now, with this advantage, that they would prevent their enemies from doing the ſame. The more I contemplate this ſubject, the more I am convinced that a war with America would be favourable to the cauſe in which Great Britain is at preſent engaged.

Another reaſon for going to war is, we ſhould *injure* (always *injure)* the manufacturers in Great Britain ; to which I beg may be added, we ſhould leave ourſelves naked. This latter may be a deſirable object with the *ſans-culottes*, though I ſhould hardly imagine that Mr. *Swanwick* would much approve of it. People vainly ſuppoſe that the very exiſtence of Great Britain depends on her commerce with this country: experience might have taught us the contrary: ſhe can do without our trade for a dozen years at a time. Nor would ſuch a contraction of her commerce at the preſent time, and *in the preſent caſe*, cauſe any diſcontent in that country.— Our behaviour would unite the nation, and the Engliſhman that would not patiently bear a temporary inconvenience or diſtreſs, that would not even ſpend his laſt ſhilling, to enable his King to revenge ſuch an abominable trait of perfidy as the annulling of this treaty, ought to be ſtripped to his ſkin, nay of his ſkin into the bargain. The fact is, that, beſides wanting the aid of France, this country would alſo want the aid of the Engliſh in this war ; and this would be one of the great differences between this war and the laſt. Laſt war, addreſſes to the people of England did much: ſome of thoſe who came to fight for the King, took very good care to fight againſt him: ſoldiers and ſailors came to deſert to their *brothers*, who were combatting in a cauſe, which was pretty generally looked upon as

the cauſe of Britons. Things are now changed. *Doctor Franklin*, were he to riſe from the dead, would not now be heard at the bar of the Houſe of Lords. No Engliſh Lord, *after the fate of Lord Chatham's ſtatue* at Charleſton, will ever take upon him the cauſe of this country; unleſs indeed it be Earl Stanhope, who *wiſhes to be hanged* *. *Doctor Prieſtley* we have the happineſs to have among us, and therefore he can do his country no more harm. No: if we are to have war, let us come forward boldly like republicans, and tell the Britiſh we abhor and deteſt them. No wheedling, no coaxing. Let thoſe who have burnt that nation's flag, and called for all the thunderbolts in the ſtores of Heaven to be hurled on them, expect from them all the miſchief they can poſſibly do.

I know that ſuch language as this is unuſual in this country. It would be much more pleaſing to dwell on the power of the United States and the decrepit ſtate of Great Britain; but I am no candidate for popular favour or applauſe. I delight in ſpeaking hard truths; and beſides, this is not the time for jeſting or flattery.

I have hitherto proceeded upon the ſuppoſition that the people of this country would be all united in the cauſe of the war. But how far would this be from the caſe! Almoſt all the rich, almoſt all the people of property, would be oppoſed to it. There is another and ſtill more dangerous kind of diviſion, which would finally end in a diſſolution of the Union: I mean the diviſion of the North from the South. The enemies of peace, in the Houſe of Repreſentatives, are, with two honourable exceptions, to be found almoſt ſolely in the ſouthern States. Can

* Such was really the fate of Lord Chatham's ſtatue at Charleſton, in the ſpring of 1794. Mr. *William Pitt*'s effigy was burnt in the ſame town, and on the ſame day.

it

it be imagined, that the honeſt and induſtrious people of the North will ſuffer themſelves to be dragged down to perdition, merely to ſatisfy the unprincipled vengeance of a neſt of fraudulent debtors? Can it be imagined, that the New-Englanders will tamely ſuffer the *lords* of Virginia to ſport with their proſperity and happineſs, as they do with their barrels of rice and tobacco at a cock-match? Common ſenſe forbids us to believe any ſuch thing.

I have ſuppoſed alſo, that the Government would retain its preſent form; but can this poſſibly be ſo? No; the moment a war ſhould be declared, in conſequence of the rejection of the treaty, the Conſtitution would be thrown aſide as uſeleſs lumber. A revolutionary ſtate muſt ſucceed. Then our Briſſots and our Robeſpierres would mount the throne: we have them ready at hand, and a war is all that is wanting to bring them forth. We ſhould have our *ariſtocrats*; indeed, they are already pointed out: the erection of a guillotine is all that remains for the *patriots* to do, preparatory to their execution. In ſhort, do we envy the French their ſituation, or do we not? Do we wiſh to experience thoſe ſufferings, at the recital of which we now weep? Do we wiſh to witneſs all thoſe cruelties, thoſe frightful horrors that freeze the blood and make us aſhamed of our ſpecies? If we do, a war, at the preſent moment, will infallibly bring us the object of our wiſhes, and we ſhall do well to ſecond the endeavours of the Livingſtons, and Madiſons, and the Gallatins.

I am perſuaded, that the following letter, from my *Couſin Hedgehog* at New-York, will not be unacceptable to my readers.

New-York, 21ſt April, 1796.

DEAR COUSIN,

I have long been a conſtant reader of your uſeful works, and, as belonging to a branch of you family, I have

I have taken to myſelf ſome part of the honour which their boldneſs and evident object reflect on the author; but, as my branch is a younger, or ſubaltern one, and as I have not had the folly to adopt the levelling principles of the ſans-culottes of the preſent day, I have not till now preſumed to intrude on your time, nor ſhould I have done it at all, had not the democratic tricks in this city ſeemed to call aloud for publicity.

Without further apology, then, I take the liberty to inform you, that yeſterday an aſſembly was held in the Bridewell Fields (they were, you ſee, on their own dunghill) to re-damn the treaty; or, in other words, to decide on a *petition* to *order* the Houſe of Repreſentatives not to paſs the laws neceſſary for carrying it into effect. As all the merchants, and other inhabitants of credit and conſequence, had before ſigned a petition to a contrary effect, you will eaſily ſuppoſe of whom this Bridewell meeting was compoſed. The hour was twelve o'clock, when *labourers* of every deſcription were at leiſure to attend. P. R. Liv—ton and M. Liv—ton *(worthy* relations of our *nominal* Repreſentative) were the leading orators. After theſe came their coadjutor, Francis Van D—ke, a chocolate-grinder, known only for his ſtupid head, his rancorous heart, his ſour phiz, and the ridiculous buſtle he made about the *tri-coloured flag*, that ſome wag had the libertiside impudence to tear down from the place where it was hoiſted in our Coffee-houſe. This man was *chairman* of the meeting. The next orator was Serj—t Cl—ke, ſo confeſſedly in the pay in France, that he once actually ſued G—net for not paying his *ſecret ſervices* according to ſtipulated agreement. This "pretended patriot," previous to the meeting, adverti ſed for the purpoſe of purchaſing "ſeveral "thouſand of hoop-poles, to be uſed as *junkets* "(*alias* bludgeons) on the day of parade."

The

The complexion of the meeting was ſuch, that it is ſaid even the Liv—tons *bluſhed* at it. This, however, nobody that knows the thickneſs of their ſkin will believe. A petition was drawn up; but, as the aſſiſtants could not be ſuppoſed capable of ſigning their names, and as in making their marks they muſt have rendered the paper as ſooty as their own paws, a Committee was appointed to ſign for them, though the paws of this Committee are certainly not much *cleaner* than thoſe of the aſſembly in general.

What effect ſuch a petition as this may have I know not: the ſapient heads of the Oppoſition ſeem to be turned; but they may reſt aſſured, that, if they have *ſold* us to France, the bargain will not ſtand. They object to our treaty with Britain, becauſe contracted without their conſent, and we ſhall object to their treaty with France, becauſe contracted without our conſent. This is fighting them at their own weapons.

I muſt now call your attention to another event. On the 12th inſtant, one *Kettlatas*, whoſe offence was that of *vilifying the aſſembly of the State*, was ſet at liberty, and drawn in triumph through the ſtreets, ſeated in an old ragged phaeton, by the guards of the city; I mean the black-guards. On this joyful occaſion there was a ſort of civic feſtival. The French *hulks*, now lying in our harbour (where they have lain for nine months paſt, and where they will lie while there is an Engliſh armed ſhip at ſea), decorated themſelves in all their ſans-culotte paraphernalia, uſually exhibited at the triumph of ſavage anarchy over order and law.

Thus you ſee the cloſe connexion that every where exiſts between the French and the brutal enemies of our Government. Theſe are inſults that no Government ever before put up with; inſults,

ſults, I truſt, we ſhall not long ſuffer with impunity.

I am, &c.

J. HEDGEHOG.

P. S. Unfortunately, your intelligence, in the laſt *Cenſor*, concerning our malicious Argus (as far as relates to his deceaſe), was not well founded. A *French* ſurgeon ſewed up his neck, and the wretch is now dropping about his *aqua fortis* with as much malice as ever. Would not your quills and his eyes meet very lovingly together? My prickles are not long enough.

POLITICAL CENSOR.

No. IV.

Proceedings in the Houſe of Repreſentatives.

WHEN the laſt Cenſor went to the preſs, the long-conteſted and important queſtion on the treaty with Great Britain was ſtill undecided. Go! ſaid I, gentle Cenſor, and in thy mild and conciliating accents, beſeech the deſperate demagogues to ſpare us a little longer.

A ſort of cloud had interpoſed between the people and the ſun of proſperity. Terror had ſeized on all thoſe who had ſomething to loſe; they knew not whether it was prudent to buy or to ſell; whether their ſhips were ſafeſt in the harbour or out at ſea; the ſans-culottes began to grind their teeth and whet their couteaux, while the heads of the ariſtocrats ſeemed to totter on their ſhoulders, and hang as it were by a bit of ſkin.

In this ſituation were we, when, on the 29th of April, the queſtion was taken in a Committee of the whole Houſe. The *Ayes* were 49—and the *Noes* 49: the Chairman, Mr. Muhlenberg of Pennſylvania, gave the caſting vote in the affirmative.

Thus was the fate of a nation ſuſpended upon the voice of one man, and thus have we once more narrowly eſcaped war and anarchy.

Some benignant ſylph certainly whiſpered Mr. Muhlenberg in the ear; for it is well known that he had been a declared enemy to the treaty from the

firſt moment of its appearance. He was one of the leaders at the town meeting held at Philadelphia, on the 25th of July, 1795. At this meeting "the "d—ned treaty was kicked to hell," and the Aſſembly adjourned to go and break Mr. Bingham's windows. This meeting appointed a Committee to draw up a Memorial, praying the Preſident not to ratify the treaty. The Memorial, after reprobating every article of the treaty ſingly, concludes thus: "Your "Committee apprehend that great evils would re- "ſult to theſe States from this treaty, if ratified; "they therefore recommend that an addreſs be pre- "pared, and preſented to the Preſident of the United "States, praying that he will not ratify the ſaid "treaty." Now, Mr. Muhlenberg was one of the very Committee who drew up this Memorial. Nor did his oppoſition ceaſe here, for we find him voting for the papers, and for the proteſting reſolution of Mr. Blount. Had he not voted for this latter reſolution, I could have admitted that he gave his caſting vote from a perſuaſion that the Houſe had no right to ſet the treaty aſide; but in voting for the reſoluſion of Mr. Blount, he inſiſts on this right, and therefore the caſting vote remains to be accounted for. Idle ſtories go about: ſlander is ever on the wing: for my part, I am not one of thoſe who will give credit to nothing that they cannot ſee through; but I leave a myſtery as I find it. This miraculous converſion is certainly to be attributed to the interpoſition of ſome *inviſible* power; to that power let us return our thanks, and not to Mr. Muhlenberg.

But though the reſolution for carrying the treaty into effect had paſſed in the Committee, it had yet to get through the Houſe, and much apprehenſion was entertained for its ſafety on the paſſage. The Oppoſition was determined to diſpute the ground to the laſt inch; accordingly, when the reſolution was taken up in the Houſe, on the 30th, *Mr. Dearborn* moved

moved the following preamble to it; "That although "in the opinion of this Houſe the treaty is *highly* "*objectionable*, and *may prove injurious to the United* "*States*, yet, conſidering all the circumſtances re- "lating thereto, particularly that the laſt 18 articles "are to continue in force only during the preſent "war, and two years thereafter, and confiding alſo "in the efficacy of meaſures which may be taken for "bringing about a diſcontinuance of the violations "committed on our neutral rights, in regard to our "veſſels and ſeamen, therefore;" &c.

This was the laſt ſhift of a baffled faction. 'If 'you do carry the treaty,' ſaid they, 'your reſolu- 'tion ſhall contain the proofs of your own folly and 'inconſiſtency.' The plan was well laid: it was expected that ſome of the members who had voted for the reſolution the day before, would alſo vote for the preamble; nor was this improbable; any inconſiſtency might be expected from ſome of them.

Mr. Muhlenberg, as if afraid of being outſtripped by Mr. Chriſtie and ſome others, haſtened to give the preamble his entire approbation, and did at laſt actually vote for it. Thus we ſee this Gentleman firſt oppoſing the treaty at a town meeting, and drawing up a Memorial beſeeching the Preſident not to ratify it; then we find him voting for a reſolution that declares the Houſe to have a right to ſet the treaty aſide; but when called on for his caſting voice, he ſeems to have forgotten all about the evil tendency of the treaty and the unmaking power of the Houſe. Sleep, however, ſeems to have refreſhed his memory, and we find him next day voting for a preamble that declares this treaty "*highly objectionable*, "*and that it may prove injurious to the United States*;" but in leſs than ten minutes afterwards, he falls back into his old ſtate of torpidity, and really votes for this very "highly objectionable and injurious treaty," without any modification or preamble at all. What

an excellent political weathercock! He tacks with ten times the celerity of the Indian on the top of his ſugar-houſe.

When the preamble was put, there appeared according to the counting, or rather miſcounting, of the "*Calm Obſerver*," *Ayes* 49 and *Noes* 49; conſequently the Speaker, Mr. Dayton, was called on for the caſting vote, and he gave it in the negative.

Thus another caſting vote preſerved the honour of the Houſe, as a former one had done that of the nation. But it muſt be remarked here, that when the names of the members came to be printed, it appeared 50 had voted in the negative; ſo that there was a majority againſt the inconſiſtent preamble, even without the caſting vote of the Speaker.

Mr. Jekyll, in his account of the *Habeas Corpus* act (Woodfall's Reports for 1794, vol. iv. p. 12), ſays, "This act was firſt obtained by ſomething like "a miracle. In one ſtage it was carried in the up-"per Houſe by a ſort of *pious fraud:* one of the "tellers ſeeing a very *fat* Lord coming in, and "knowing him to be a man of *weight*, counted him "for *ten*." I ſhould have thought that, for like reaſons, Mr. Muhlenberg had been counted for *two*, had not the error been by ſubtraction in place of addition. Whether the *fraud* would have been quite ſo *pious* on this occaſion, as in obtaining the act of *Habeas Corpus*, is another thing: yes, Mr. Beckley, that's another thing.

How the Clerk of the Houſe came to miſcount, or how his miſcounting came to paſs unreproved when diſcovered, are queſtions well worth aſking. Such miſtakes are not common, nor is it likely that an extraordinary degree of inattentiveneſs would prevail at ſuch an important moment. I do not pretend to dictate to members of Congreſs; but were I one, I would exert my utmoſt to diſplace a Clerk who would dare to miſtate a vote of the Houſe, though

that

that Clerk ſhould be the very image of *Lord Chalk-ſtone* himſelf.

Finally, the reſolution of Mr. Hillhouſe was put, in its original form: "Reſolved, that the neceſſary "laws be paſſed for carrying into effect the treaty "concluded between his Britannic Majeſty and the "United States."—The *Ayes* and *Noes* were as follows:

Ayes.—Meſſieurs Ames, *Bailey*, Bourne, Bradbury, Buck, *Chriſtie*, Coit, Cooper, Crabb, *Dent*, A. Foſter, D. Foſter, Gilbert, Gilman, Glenn, Goodhue, Goodrich, *Gregg*, Griſwold, Grove, *Hancock*, Harper, Hartley, Henderſon, Hillhouſe, Hindman, *Kitchell*, Kittera, Leonard, S. Lyman, Malbone, *Muhlenberg*, Murray, Reed, *Richards*, Sedgwick, Sitgreaves, J. Smith, N. Smith, Iſaac Smith, *S. Smith*, W. Smith, Swift, Thatcher, Thomas, Thompſon, Tracey, Van Allen, *Van Courtlandt*, Wadſworth, Williams.—51.

Noes.—Meſſieurs Baird, Baldwin, Benton, Blount, Brent, Bryan, Burgeſs, Caleb, Claiborne, Clopton, Coles, Dearborn, Earle, Franklin, Gallatin, Gilleſpie, Giles, Greenup, Hampton, Harriſon, Hathorn, Havens, Heath, Heiſter, Holland, Jackſon, Livingſton, Locke, W. Lyman, Maclay, Macon, Madiſon, Milledge, Moore, New, Nicholas, Orr, Page, Parker, Preſton, Rutherford, Iſrael Smith, Sprigg, Swanwick, Tatom, Varnum, Venable, Winn.—48.

The reſolution paſſed of courſe, and a Committee was appointed to bring in the bills.

The reader will recollect, that to know the real inclinations of the members, he muſt obſerve who voted for the call for papers, and who did not. In the preſent liſt for *Ayes*, I have marked in *italics* thoſe members who have voted in favour of Mr. Livingſton's *paper motion*, that ſuch as laboured through the heat of the day may be diſtinguiſhed

from ſuch as did not drop in until the eleventh hour.

The Repreſentatives who voted on this memorable queſtion, may be divided into three claſſes: 1. ſtaunch friends of the Conſtitution and the treaty; 2. the converts; 3. the hardened political ſinners.

As to the firſt of theſe claſſes, I ſhall ſay nothing: the perſons compoſing it are ſo much above all praiſe, that I could not hope to do them juſtice. They will find an ample reward in the ſucceſs of their indefatigable efforts, and in the grateful acknowledgments of all their worthy conſtituents.

The ſecond claſs, or the *converts*, merit but little thanks from any body. Their apologies for ſhifting ſides were, as indeed apologies generally are, a moſt monſtrous abuſe of words. What, for inſtance, could be more ridiculous than for a man to get up and make a long harangue, in order to perſuade *others* to vote againſt the treaty, and conclude with ſaying, that *he* ſhould vote for it?—And why?—Becauſe he would not create a diviſion between the different branches of the Government! Surpriſing! He had voted for forcing the papers out of the Preſident's hands; he had alſo voted for the reſolution that was to remain as a proteſt againſt the Preſident's refuſing of theſe papers; and, at laſt, he votes for the treaty, in order to cultivate harmony between the different branches of the Government! The Gentleman ſeems to have fallen out with the other branches, merely to have the pleaſure of making it up again. This farce may, then, take the name of a comedy lately written by a Citizen of Philadelphia: "The Triumphs of Love; or, Happy Reconci-" liation."

The fact is, however, this converſion was not owing to a conciliating diſpoſition in the converted. Had it not been for the manly, prudent, and well-timed meaſures of the merchants of Philadelphia, this

this important treaty would have been ſet aſide*. However indifferent the converts might be to the ſuſpenſion of enſurance and the general ſhock given to buſineſs of every kind; however they might affect to laugh at the alarmiſts, they would have been afraid to return among their conſtituents, had they plunged the country into diſtreſs and confuſion. Very probably their turn for roaſting would have come: they might have ſeen their effigies dragged about in a dung-cart, with French gold in their hands. Happy might they have

---

* The following Memorial was preſented to the Houſe on the 17th of April.

" To the Honourable the Houſe of Repreſentatives of the United States.

" *The Memorial of the Subſcribers, Merchants and Traders of Philadelphia,*

" Reſpectfully repreſents,

" That they have waited, with anxious expectation, to ſee the " neceſſary meaſures adopted by your honourable Houſe for car- " rying into operation the treaty concluded between the United " States and Great Britain, and are now ſeriouſly alarmed leſt " thoſe meaſures ſhould be further delayed or entirely omitted.

" Under that impreſſion, they deem it incumbent on them to " repreſent, that the property of the merchants of the United " States, amounting, upon a moderate computation, to more " than five millions of dollars, has been taken from them by the " ſubjects of Great Britain, the reſtitution of which they verily " believe depends in a great meaſure upon the completion of " the treaty on our part.

" Independent of this immenſe ſum, they have embarked the " principal part of their remaining fortunes in veſſels and adven- " tures, the ſafety of which will, as they apprehend, be mate- " rially affected by a refuſal or neglect on the part of the United " States to comply with ſtipulations ſo ſolemnly entered into. Be- " ſides their particular intereſts as merchants and traders, they " feel an intereſt, in common with their fellow-citizens of other " deſcriptions, in the preſervation of peace, on which the pro- " ſperity of this country depends; and they ſhould deem them- " ſelves wanting in that ſpirit and independence which ought " ever to characterize freemen, if they forbear, on ſo intereſting

have thought themſelves, if a juſtly enraged people had confined their vengeance to the burning of images and pictures when the originals were at hand. Their recantation was, in ſhort, like that of a man who ſees the ſtake and the faggots before him. I look upon their ſupport of Government, on the preſent occaſion, as a ſort of verbal conformity with a mental reſervation. Few people are dupes enough to believe them ſincere. The doſe they have ſwallowed with ſo many wry faces, has only ſerved to ſet their gall in motion: the executive branch of Government may expect at their hands every check and impediment that diſappointed malice can ſuggeſt.

But little merit as I aſcribe to the *converts*, and little hope as I have of their reformation, I muſt ſtill prefer them to the hardened ſinners; for though a ſort of death-bed repentance, ſuch, for inſtance, as that of the *caſting voice*, can never be ſuppoſed to atone for a life of political ſin, yet it is at any rate leſs offenſive to morality and decency, than to hear the ſons of reprobation blaſpheming to the laſt gaſp, and expiring with curſes on their lips.

All the 48 members found in the Oppoſition on

"an occaſion as the preſent, to expreſs their wiſhes and expecta-
"tions. They, therefore, with all due reſpect for the Repreſent-
"atives of the people of the United States, beg leave to recom-
"mend that no partial conſiderations of policy may influence their
"deciſion on this important queſtion; but that they both the
"honour and the intereſt of the nation may be preſerved, by
"making the neceſſary proviſions for carrying the treaty into
"fair and honourable effect."

Nor did the merchants of the capital ſtop here: they appointed a Committee to correſpond with other mercantile towns, and with the back counties of Pennſylvania. This meaſure brought ſuch ſwarms of petitions from the people of property of every quarter of the Union, that the Oppoſition began to perceive how little their own ſtrength was.

the

the definitive queſtion concerning the treaty, will unavoidably meet with the approbation of the French National Convention. They all certainly merit the fraternal hug; but there are ſome of them whom it would be unjuſt to mix promiſcuouſly with the common herd: theſe ought to have a kiſs on both cheeks, while the reſt might be put off with a kiſs on one; or if French politeneſs will inſiſt upon the *double baiſes* to all, the five Kings might ſalute the leaders, while the reſt might be left to the ſkinny-lipped blood-ſuckers of the Council of Elders.

In order to regulate the ceremonial, I ſhall point out thoſe whom I think entitled to the diſtinguiſhed honour of being ſlobbered by the five Sultans; obſerving, once for all, that I do not wiſh to depreciate the value of any man's labour, or interfere with any bargain that might be previouſly entered into between the parties. The labourer is worthy of his hire, whether he ſucceeds in his object or not.

To place the *Italian* at the head of theſe worthies is an act of juſtice, and an act of juſtice which I have the more pleaſure in performing, as I have lately been accuſed (how falſely every body knows) of attempting to ſink that Gentleman in the opinion of the public.

When the treaty-making power was to be attacked; or, in other words, when a breach was to be made in the Conſtitution, and ſuch a breach as never could have been cloſed, the aſſailants ſeemed at a loſs for a leader. Citizen Madiſon ſhrank from the taſk. The eyes of the phalanx at laſt turned towards the *Italian*. Murderers, when preparing for their horrid work, always chooſe from among their gang, ſome preciouſly ill-looking villain to give the firſt ſtab; that done, they fall on with leſs remorſe, and diſpatch the proſtrate victim. I do not pretend to ſay that the aſſailants of the Conſtitution acted upon the

the ſame maxims of phyſiognomy: no, God forbid I ſhould ſay or inſinuate any ſuch thing; on the contrary, if perſon had any thing to do in the matter, I ſhould rather ſuppoſe that the leader was choſen for his beauty.

Let, however, the motive to the choice be what it might, that it was a good one, we all know. With what art did the *Geneveſe* approach! How did he twiſt and turn when he found an obſtacle in his way! How did his eyes gliſten, when ready to dart in upon his devoted prey! Thoſe that followed him had little more to do than to mouth over what they had heard, as the yelping puppies of the pack give tongue, when they hear the cry of the leading old hound.

——" The *ſtaunch old hound*,
" Guide of the pack, *although gaunt and ugly*,
" Is yet of great account. He 'll oft untie
" The Gordian knot, when reaſon at a ſtand,
" Puzzling, is loſt, and every art is vain.
" *As party chiefs* in ſenates who preſide,
" With pleaded reaſon and with artful ſpeech
" Conduct the ſtaring multitude; *ſo he*
" *Directs the pack*, who with *joint cry approve*,
" And loudly *boaſt diſcoveries not their own*."

Had Somerville written his beautiful poem of *The Chaſe* but yeſterday, with the late proceedings of the Houſe of Repreſentatives before his eyes, he could not have made a more apt alluſion than is contained in the above-quoted paſſage. The reſt did, indeed, with joint cry approve, and loudly boaſt diſcoveries not their own; but the ſagacious and indefatigable *Geneveſe* untied the Gordian knot; and though his game at laſt eſcaped him, he is entitled to all the honours of the field. The grateful ſportſman, to reward his faithful and laborious cur, claps him on the back and ſpits in his mouth. And ſo our *Italian* ſhall be diſtinguiſhed from his colleagues by ſome ſuperior reward.

After

After the *Geneveſe*, I think we muſt give the precedence to the *long man* from New-York, and the *ſhort man* from Philadelphia.

From the firſt of theſe, who labours under an extreme poverty of talents, much could not be expected. His head is generally thought to be as empty as his purſe ever was, yet he certainly ſurpaſſed all his fellow-labourers, except the cunning *Italian*. He ſet out with *bluſhing*, and I leave any one to gueſs at the efforts that muſt be made to get a bluſh through a ſkin like his. Beſides, where will you find a young man of his pretenſions, a kind of creole *Adonis*, as it were, who would riſk his complexion for a ſingle moment? Who would ſuffer his pure yellow, his fine golden hue, to be mixed with red, and thus debaſed to a vile copper colour? Who would, in ſhort, ſuffer himſelf to be changed from a guinea to a halfpenny? I do not know whether the Gentleman has been *accuſtomed to ſuch depreciations* or not; but if this be the firſt time, ſuch a ſacrifice is, in my humble opinion, worthy of a capital compenſation.

I did not intend to trouble the reader with remarks on any particular paſſages of this Gentleman's ſpeeches: they are generally ſuch ſtrings of plagiariſms, that, to cenſure them, you muſt cenſure their authors; and this is ſometmes diſagreeable. One paſſage or two, however, call for obſervation, which I am the more ready to beſtow on them, as they appear to be original.

The Gentleman, in defence of his *paper motion*, told the Houſe that "it was impoſſible to determine "that they would not *impeach* until the papers were "ſeen. Facts might then appear which would ren- "der that an unavoidable meaſure which was not "now contemplated. If, for inſtance, inſtead of a "treaty with Great Britain, they were now diſcuſſ- "ing one formed with the Porte, where it is the "cuſtom for miniſters to give and to receive *preſents*;

"and

" and on the production of the correſpondence, it " ſhould appear that our Miniſter had received a " *douceur* (bribe) on the ſignature of the treaty; " would not the Houſe think themſelves obliged to " impeach ?"

This is a ſuppoſition wound up with an interrogation. Now let us ſee if we cannot ſuppoſe and put queſtions as well as this *Adonis*. Suppoſe, then, that the electors of a certain diſtrict or city were ſilly enough to chooſe as their Repreſentative, a man at once proud and poor, haughty and mean, inſolent and crawling; ſuppoſe that this man were an inſolvent debtor, who had viſited the inſide of a jail, and who had bilked his creditors by paying them but *three ſhillings in the pound*. Now ſhould a man like this riſe up in Congreſs, and adopting the ſentiments, the ſtyle, and even the geſticulations of the mob, baſely inſinuate, that a public Miniſter, of unſpotted fame, had received a bribe from a foreign Prince—what, I aſk, would ſuch a man deſerve ?—To be cut out at full length in a *living ſtone*, and ſtuck up at the corner of the *Fly-Market*, for the boys to throw rotten eggs at, till the ſtatue became as yellow as the original.

The Gentleman declared (and very *ſincerely*, without doubt) that his ſuppoſition was by no means applicable to Mr. Jay; and I declare, with equal ſincerity, that my ſuppoſition is by no means applicable to Mr. Livingſton, for whoſe feelings, as the reader muſt have already perceived, I have a wonderful tenderneſs; a tenderneſs, indeed, that I would wiſh to equal that which he has ſhown for the feelings of the Preſident and Mr. Jay.

The next paſſage that attracts my attention ſeems to be a ſort of ſide-wind eulogy on the five Kings and their mild and humane Government. " All Europe," ſays our *Adonis*, " was once free; all Europe, with " the *exception of France* and Switzerland, *are now*

" *in*

" *in chains.* Where, then, will hiſtorical facts be " found to juſtify the charge? In the obſequious " Parliament of Britain?" &c.—Poor *Adonis*, how little does he know about all Europe! And is it poſſible that any one, pretending to be a reaſonable creature, ſhould yet talk to us about French liberty? A decree launched forth by their merciful lords, the other day, will give us a pretty correct idea of Frenchmen's freedom. This decree bears, " that the " parents of emigrants ſhall *now* give up to *the* " *nation* that portion of their property which *would* " *have fallen,* after their death, to their emigrant " children." Let any one judge from this, whether the poor devils are in *chains* or not. But why do I cite particular inſtances of their ſlavery? What occaſion have I here to attempt a contradiction of what every one, even the moſt ignorant of the people, knows to be falſe and ridiculous? " In Turkey, and " in Morocco," ſays PLAYFAIR, " the people know " under what deſpotiſm they groan; they know " who their rulers are, and they know that what- " ever injuſtice they may be guilty of towards indi- " viduals, they muſt have ſome regard to the gene- " ral intereſt, to the preſervation of the whole. They " have the ſatisfaction too of complaining to a " friend in ſecret of their misfortunes; but *the mi-* " *ſerable French ſlave*, who thinks himſelf a *free ci-* " *tizen*, does not know who his maſters are. He " dares not complain, becauſe all around him con- " ſider that their miſeries are the effects of freedom " and philoſophy; and like the philoſopher Panglos, " though ruined and miſerable, they have been " taught to ſay that all is as well as poſſible.— " Wretched people! among whom every thing is at " the diſpoſition of a gang of intriguing deſpots, " who, by means of a printing-preſs and reams of " aſſignats, pillage the nation, and excite to maſ- " ſacre and bloodſhed!" This is the only people in Europe

Europe who, our *Adonis* tells us, is not in chains! I can aſſure him that ſuch an aſſertion, at this day, is barely honoured with a ſneer. The people of America have at laſt opened their eyes. They have ſeen French liberty ſeated on her throne, the guillotine, ſurrounded with confiſcations, guards, manacles, and dungeons; they have ſeen French religion exhibited in blaſphemies againſt the Almighty, and in the adoration of a common proſtitute; they have ſeen French humanity in the form of a child torn from its mother's womb, and writhing on the point of a bayonet. Yes, and they have ſeen the effects of French gold too; and I can tell you, Mr. Livingſton, that they deſpiſe the corrupter as well as the corrupted. French friendſhip they know they do not want, and French enmity is become the object of their contempt. To ply them then, Sir, with this old, ridiculous, threadbare tale of French liberty, though it may procure you a *feu de joie* from the hulks at New-York, is an inſult to the underſtandings of your conſtituents, for which I much queſtion if even your ignorance will be thought a ſufficient apology.

But it ſeems there is one other nation, beſides the French, who are *not in chains*; the Swiſs. It is ſomething ſingular that our orator forgot the republics of *Batavia* and *Geneva*. They have both the happineſs of having the ſame kind of free Government as his dear France. Their legiſlative and executive branches, and all their offices of ſtate, excepting the prime miniſter, Citizen Guillotine, are the ſame. What, then, could render them unworthy of being called free nations? How comes Switzerland, the beſt part of which *groans* under an ariſtocracy, to be preferred to theſe regenerated States, theſe apes of the French republic, theſe firſt-born of the great baboon? Our *Adonis*'s head was abſolutely turned with his paper-kite motion.

Never

Never ſurely was poor youth ſo diſcomfited, ſcouted, and routed as he has been during this ſeſſion. After a month's hard labour, the Preſident refuſes him a peep at the papers; he ſeeks vengeance, meets a ſecond rebuff, and is at laſt reduced to the mortification of ſeeing the ſchemes of nine long months overturned in a ſingle moment, in ſpite of the counter-efforts of his *worthy* relations at New-York, joined to thoſe of the Chocolate-grinder and Sergeant Clarke. In this ſituation what is he to do? Jog back quietly to daddy's, make the moſt of his perſonal charms, ogle the fair ſex in place of grinning at General Waſhington, and content himſelf with reading billets doux inſtead of ſtate papers. But, for mercy's ſake, let him take care how he *bluſhes:* "the *bankrupt*," ſays an author, "never yet found the fair one kind," and what then could he expect for a yellow boy who ſhould bluſh himſelf to Jerſey copper?

Having thus diſmiſſed the long rawboned knight of the *woful countenance*, I muſt now beg the reader's reſpectful attention, while I bring on the ſcene, probably for the laſt time, the little duck legged Squire.—There he is, like a ballad-ſinger in a fair! don't fright yourſelves, ladies; upon my ſoul he'll do you no violence. 'Tis as gentle a little creature as you ever ſet eyes on: you may even ſtroke him without apprehending the leaſt miſchief; do but liſten to his ſpeech, and he'll lick your hand like a ſpaniel.

This Gentleman's efforts on the oppoſition may be conſidered as confined to the exaltation of the *magnanimity of the King of Spain*, and that of *his own diſintereſtedneſs*. Indeed, both ſubjects were equally worthy of his ſmall-talk eloquence. The magnanimity of a man who ſhakes hands in an humble peace with the murderers of the head of his family, is well matched with the diſintereſtedneſs of another,

another, who aims at the deſtruction of his country, or at leaſt of all that is valuable in it, that he may raiſe himſelf on its ruins.

He told the Houſe that "he had ſeveral veſſels "at ſea, not enſured; that he had landed property "in great quantity;" and hence he took occaſion to conclude, that he could not be ſuſpected as wiſhing to involve the country in a war. This, indeed, from a man of moderate views, from a man of moderate vanity even, ought to have ſome weight; but from one like the perſon here ſpoken of, it ought to have none at all.

There are ſome men, who, as the poet ſays, "never are at heart's eaſe while they ſee a greater "than themſelves." Such is this Gentleman. He muſt be every where, and every where at the head; and as it commonly happens with thoſe of his ſtamp, nature has abſolutely diſqualified him for the attainment by fair means. Still, however, he drives on towards his object, and in his progreſs employs all thoſe little arts that worth and genius diſdain. How has he laboured to eſtabliſh for himſelf the character of a man of learning and taſte! How often and how bareſacedly has he condeſcended to become his own puff in the common papers! How many letters has he written to diſtant places to enſure the inſertion of articles in praiſe of himſelf! What incredible pains has he taken to procure the appearance of a ſilly poem, ſigned with his name, in a periodical publication of a foreign country!

He told the Houſe of Repreſentatives of his ſhips and his lands; he might have told them of his *houſe* too, unleſs, indeed, he looked upon that as unneceſſary, from its being ſo perfectly known. This houſe, which reſembles, in furniture, a Dutch virtuoſo's baby-hutch, is become a kind of rareeſhow. The vain proprietor acts the part of a deſpicable ſhowman. This houſe that Jack built is his hobby-horſe;

horſe; and when mounted on it, he is more an object of ridicule than the whore on the black ram, or poor Gulliver aſtride the nipple of the Brobdingnagian maid of honour.

Money however he has, and with this he finds his way into almoſt every meeting that bears the name of a *ſociety*; a name, by the by, of which moſt men of ſenſe begin to be heartily tired. Our Lilliputian, with his dollars, gets acceſs where, without them, he would not be ſuffered to appear. But of all his little baits for admiration and conſequence, none is ſurely ſo perfectly ludicrous as his becoming the Mentor of the *little miſſes*. That a vain man ſhould condeſcend to cajole the mob, to greaſe the hands of the leaders of a club or ſociety; that he ſhould crawl to news-printers, or even run dangling about after ſpectators to admire his taſty manſion, is not ſo very ſurpriſing; but that he ſhould ſo far defy the power of ridicule as to profeſs himſelf the periodical declaimer at the breakings up of a boarding-ſchool, and even ſhow an uncommon anxiety to have his ſpeeches on thoſe occaſions publiſhed, is what no mortal could ever have expected, no, not from John Swanwick.

What attention is due to a man like this, when he produces the coincidence of his own intereſt with that of his own country as a proof that his conduct is in conformity to both? Such a man feels intereſted in nothing that does not bring food to his vanity; and if a greater quantity of this is to be obtained by the loſs of his property than by its preſervation, he will never ſcruple to hazard it. Where then are his diſintereſtedneſs and his patriotiſm?

At firſt glance, one would imagine that a being like this was formed for the contempt, or at leaſt for the diverſion of mankind; and, under certain Governments, he would, indeed, be harmleſs; but in a ſtate where all depends upon the popular voice, I

do not know a more dangerous character. Of a proud man you have ſome hold; his pride will not let him ſtoop to ſuch meanneſſes, by which alone he can come at the power that makes him formidable; while the vain one will ſtop at nothing. Knowing that the accompliſhment of his hopes depends on the people, and that it is to numbers he muſt owe his ſucceſs, he ſpeculates in their errors and their prejudices, and turns them to his own advantage at the expenſe of the community. No rebuff, no ill treatment or diſcomfit, diſcourages him: kick him out at your front door, and he will come in at the back: drive him from one office or one aſſembly, and he will get into another: ſomewhere he will be, where he can make himſelf talked of. He is ever the cringing ſlave of power; he adores it, in whatever hands it may be found: as he wheedles a democratic populace, ſo would he the cruelleſt deſpot on earth: he has not a drop of independent blood in his heart, and he is the mortal enemy of all thoſe who have.

That ſuch a man as this ſhould be the Repreſentative of a State of which I am an inhabitant, is, I muſt confeſs, a mortification; as to repreſenting me, however, he never did, nor ſhall he ever do it: therefore, as a fraction of the ſovereign people, I do hereby, once for all, enter my proteſt againſt every thing that he may do, or have a hand in.—When he looks round, from his hobby-horſe, on the multitude who have been weak enough to commit their intereſts to his ſapient head and inflated heart, let him remember, that there is one who would not truſt him with the ſtump of an old worn-out pen.

When I ſee people, who have choſen a Repreſentative like this, brought to the verge of ruin by him and his aſſociates, I cannot ſay I pity them. Many of the merchants and traders who were ſo

alarmed the other day, on account of the oppoſition to the treaty, had uſed every effort in their power to enſure this man's election. What muſt be their reflections, when they ſaw him, not only voting for the deſtruction of their property and themſelves, but endeavouring to nullify their petition by another, ſigned by foreigners, blackguards, and negroes? Surely this ought to be a leſſon to thoſe, who are to chooſe or reject him another time. But, indeed, men of property, men who ought to be of weight, are in this country, as in moſt others, indifferent and ſlothful as to their political rights. Whatever may be the cauſe of this, the conſequences are well known, they are already felt, and will from day to day, and from year to year, be felt more ſeverely.

Thus I have endeavoured to juſtify the preference to be given to theſe three heroes of the *hardened ſinners*. Citizen Madiſon was formerly reckoned as a ſort of chief; but he has ſo ſunk out of ſight this campaign, that we can look upon him, at leaſt, as no more than an aid-de-camp. The firm and *indiviſible* phalanx of Virginia were led on by a younger, more bold, and more artful commander; had victory decided in their favour, the citizen would have put in his claim to a ſhare in the glory of the day; but the timely deſertion of the *heavy horſe* of Philadelphia, and the diſgraceful defeat that ſucceeded, have left him without even the hope of repairing his reputation. As a politician he is no more; he is abſolutely deceaſed, cold, ſtiff, and buried in oblivion for ever and ever.

There are, then, but three of theſe gentlemen whom I look upon as entitled to the *collade fraternelle* from the five Kings; the others muſt put up with a ſmack from the *elders* or *youngers*.

There is one difficulty remaining, which it will

not be very eaſy to get over; that is, the parties are at ſuch a diſtance from each other, that to embrace in perſon would be impoſſible, unleſs one or the other would be content to make a voyage; a thing which we cannot expect; for, like the buzzard, neither like to loſe ſight of their prey. 'T is true, that in France they do embrace by proxy; and probably this may be now reſorted to. We can very well ſpare a deputation; and if they ſhould never return, few, I believe, would mourn their loſs.

I now bid the oppoſers of the treaty farewell: they and I have been at war for rather better than a year: I have ſeen them completely beaten; and though I pretend to no other merit than the little that is due to a diligent drummer or trumpeter, I muſt be permitted to rejoice as well as others. Rejoice I certainly do at their downfal, and notwithſtanding I think it unmanly to ſet my foot upon the neck of a proſtrate foe, no endeavours of mine ſhall be wanting to prevent them from riſing again.

Paine's Age of Reaſon.

The Chriſtian religion teaches men to forego their private intereſts for the ſake of doing good; it is not therefore ſurpriſing, that deiſts and atheiſts ſhould forego their private intereſts for the ſake of doing miſchief. Things oppoſite in their nature muſt be expected to be oppoſite in their effects.

The Editor of the *Aurora* of Philadelphia (Mr. Franklin Bache) has advertized for ſale a Second Part of Paine's Age of Reaſon, at a *low price*. It is ſaid, he has received *fifteen thouſand* copies of this from Paris, and it is very certain that he ſells them at a price which will hardly pay firſt coſt and expenſes. When I went to ſchool, I remember we had for a copy, "*Zeal* in *a good cauſe* deſerves *applauſe*." If this

this old maxim be a true one, I would aſk, what *zeal* in a *bad cauſe* deſerves?

A perſon to whom the parties were well known, has aſſured me, that poor Paine imbibed his firſt principles of deiſm from Doctor Franklin; if ſo, it is poſſible that the Editor of the *Aurora* may look upon the diſtribution of the Age of Reaſon as a mean of propagating his grandfather's principles; and ſo far *ſome perſons* will defend it, as an act of filial piety, or rather filial gratitude; for, as to piety, I think we may venture to leave it out of the queſtion.

This grateful young man ſhould, however, recollect, that a vender of poiſon will not be excuſed merely becauſe the compound was kneaded up, or the receipt for it given by his anceſtor. Deiſm cannot be well ſaid to run in the blood, or I ſhould really be afraid that the deſcendant of the illuſtrious old deiſt was contaminated. Charity bids me to hope the contrary, and to aſcribe the exceſs of his zeal to the amiable motive above mentioned.

It is going too far, perhaps, to ſay, that any loſs on theſe blaſphemous pamphlets is to fall on Mr. Bache. The French Republic has ever ſhown a ſincere deſire of regenerating us, and as ſhe finds us obſtinate in politics, ſhe may be willing to try her hand in another way. The papers have told us lately, that Mad Tom takes up his lodgings at the houſe of the American Ambaſſador; if this Second Part of the Age of Reaſon ſhould have come to us under his auſpices, it is a fact of a curious nature indeed.

As to the work itſelf, it cannot be better deſcribed than by ſaying that it is as ſtupid and deſpicable as its author. The wretch has all his life been employed in leading fools aſtray from their duty, and, as nothing is more eaſy, he has often ſucceeded. His religion is exactly of a piece with his politics; one inculcates the right of revolting againſt Government, and the other that of revolting againſt God. Having ſucceeded againſt the Lord's anointed (I mean

his and our *ci-devant* friend, the Moſt Chriſtian King) he turned his impious arms againſt the Lord himſelf. This proceſs is perfectly natural, as has been exemplified in the conduct of others as well as that of Paine.

How Tom came to think of exerciſing his clumſy battered pen upon the Chriſtian religion, is what has excited a good deal of curioſity, without ever being well accounted for in this country: notwithſtanding, the circumſtances under which a man writes ought to be attended to in forming a judgment of his opinions, particularly if thoſe opinions are new and extraordinary. For this reaſon I ſhall endeavour to trace this raggamuffin deiſt from America to his Paris dungeon, and to account for his having laid down the dagger of inſurrection in order to take up the chalice of irreligion.

Thomas, after having retailed out a good deal of very *common ſenſe*, commonly called *nonſenſe*, found himſelf rather richer than when he began *. This gave him a ſmack for revolutions; but finding himſelf ſinking faſt into his native mud, and pretty univerſally deſpiſed and neglected by the people of this country; finding, in ſhort, that the Americans were returning to order, and feeling that his element was confuſion, he croſſed the Atlantic to baſk in the rays of the French revolution.

The *Propagande* at Paris, that is, the ſociety inſtituted for the propagation of the vile and deteſtable principles of the *Rights of Man*, as laid down in the

* In his Second Part of the Rights of Man, he ſays he has a *place* in the State of Delaware. Whether this be a lie or not, I cannot tell; but if it be true, it was certainly the product of the revolution; for every one knows he had nothing before. This was encouragement for him to try his talent in other countries. A confiſcated caſtle in France, or ſome abbey where he might join ſacrilege to robbery, was a ſufficient temptation to lead him acroſs the ocean.

famous

famous French Conſtitution, fixed their Jacobinical eyes on Tom, as an excellent miſſionary for Great Britain and Ireland. Off goes Tom with his Rights of Man, which he had the abominable impudence to dedicate to *General Waſhington* *. The Engliſh Jacobins ſtared at him at firſt: he went a ſtep further than they had ever dreamed of: his doctrines, however, grew familiar to their ears: they took him under their wing, and he made ſure of another revolution. This ſecurity was his misfortune, and had nearly coſt him a voyage to the South Sea.

From the thief-catchers in England Tom fled, and took his ſeat among the thieves of Paris. After having diſtinguiſhed himſelf in execrating the Conſtitution he had written in defence of, he and two or three others ſet to work and made a new one, quite brand new, without a ſingle ounce of old ſtuff. This covered Tom with glory ſoon after, when it was unanimouſly accepted by the rich, free, generous and *humane* French nation.

This may be looked upon as the happieſt part of Tom's life. He had enjoyed partial revolts before, had ſeen doors and windows broken in, and had probably partaken of the pillage of ſome ariſtocratic ſtores and dwelling-houſes; but to live in a continual ſtate of inſurrection, "ſacred, holy, organized "inſurrection;" to ſit ſeven days in the week iſſuing decrees for plunder, proſcription, and maſſacre, was a luxurious life indeed! It was, however, a ſhort life and a merry one: it laſted but five months. The tender-hearted philanthropic murderer, Briſſot, and his faction, fell from the pinnacle of their glory: poor Tom's wares got out of vogue, and his carcaſs got into a dungeon.

* The *Second Part* was dedicated to *La Fayette*, to which nobody had any kind of objection.

This was a dreadful reverſe for old Common Senſe. To be hurled, all in a moment, from the tip top of the *Mountain* of the *Grande Convention Nationale* down to the very bottom of a ſtinking dungeon, was enough to give a ſhock to his poor unſteady brain. But this was not all; he well knew that the national razor was at work, and had every reaſon to ſuppoſe that his days were numbered. He lay extended on the dirt, like a ſheep or a calf in a ſlaughter-houſe, expecting every moment that the butcher would come for him.

How Thomas came to eſcape, is ſomething that will probably remain a myſtery. It was ſaid that *Danton* (the new chief tyrant) ſpared his life at the requeſt of certain Americans; but this is improbable, not that ſome Americans might be found ſilly enough to petition for it, but becauſe, when his enlargement was afterwards demanded, upon the ſcore of his being an American, the ruling tyrants anſwered, that he was a *ſacré Anglois*, a d—n'd Engliſhman. The fact is, I believe, Danton and his party deſpiſed Tom too much to run any riſk of diſobliging their friends in Great Britain and America, by taking away his worthleſs life. Be the motive what it might, he was kept in his cage, and there he wrote the Firſt Part of his *Age of Reaſon*.

Now to the motive that led him to the compoſition of this blaſphemous work, which was no other than that of ſaving his ugly uncombed head from the guillotine.

The reader will recollect that it was under the reign of *Danton* that the Chriſtian religion was aboliſhed by a decree. A few days before Tom's impriſonment the famous feſtival of Reaſon was held. A common ſtrumpet was dreſſed up as the *Goddeſs Reaſon**, ſeated on a throne of turf, and, while in-

* She was guillotined ſoon after.

cenſe was burnt before her altar at ſome little diſtance, the idolatrous populace, with the Convention at their head, proſtrated themſelves before her. Not many days before this, the *conſtitutional* Biſhop of Paris *, with his Vicars and three Rectors, came to the Convention and abdicated their religion, declaring themſelves to have been cheats, and that in future they would profeſs no other worſhip than that of *Reaſon*. In ſhort, *Danton* and *Robeſpierre* (then ſecond in command) were inceſſantly occupied in extirpating the ſmall remains of Chriſtianity from the minds of the poor brutified and enſlaved French. It was a neceſſary preparation to the bloody work they intended they ſhould execute.

Citizen Common Senſe knew this, and therefore it was not wonderful that he ſhould attempt to ſoften his lot, and prolong, perhaps, his miſerable days by ſomething from his pen, calculated at once to flatter their vanity and further their execrable views. Thomas had long railed againſt the baſeneſs of courtiers; but when the moment of trial came, he was found as baſe as the baſeſt. The high-minded republican Paine, who had ſet Lords and Kings at defiance, was glad to bend the knee before a vile, low-bred, French pettifogger. He deſcended to make uſe of the very phraſes that the new tyrants had introduced. The Goddeſs was called *Reaſon*, the church which was profaned by her worſhip was called the *Temple of Reaſon*, and the inſcription on the banners carried at the feſtival was "*The Age of Reaſon*" (Le Siècle de la Raiſon), the very title of Tom's book. Baſe adulation! adulation not to be excuſed even by the ſituation in which he was. The old French clergy, with the daggers at their breaſt, ſcorned to purchaſe life at ſuch a price.

* The *conſtitutional* clergy means the *new clergy*, the *clergy of the revolution*, *the apoſtates*.

I would

I would by no means be underſtood as believing that Paine's book was a deſertion of his principles; for, as before obſerved, he had been corrupted years before. It is the diſgraceful motive for publiſhing his creed that I am expoſing. That it was done to make his court to the tyrants of the day, cannot be doubted; for in all his former works, if he has occaſion to ſpeak of the Chriſtian religion, he does it in decent, if not reſpectful language. In his Rights of Man, for inſtance, he extols toleration, and obſerves, that *all religions are good*; but as ſoon as he had got into his new-faſhioned ſtudy, a dungeon, he diſcovered that *they were all bad*, or at leaſt the Chriſtian religion, and it was of the divers denominations of that religion that he before *pretended* to ſpeak. When he ſaid that all religions were good, he was an abominable hypocrite, or he is one now, when he tells us that the Chriſtian religion is a very bad one. Either he diſguiſed his ſentiments to deceive the Engliſh, or he has ſince done ſo to deceive *Danton* and *Robeſpierre*. Tom knows the value of a character for conſiſtency too well to run the riſk of loſing it, unleſs upon a preſſing emergency: but the guillotine was yet red with the blood of his comrades, and he well knew that there was but this one way of keeping his own corrupted ſtreams within his veins.

It will be ſaid by Tom's deiſtical friends, that the *Second Part* of the Age of Reaſon was written after his releaſement, and at a time when he was in no danger. Very true; but the die was caſt; the *Firſt Part* was out, and there was no recalling it. He had openly attacked both Heaven and earth; he could do no more. One eſſay at blaſphemy was as good as a thouſand for eſtabliſhing his new pretenſions to infamy; but Thomas had now ſomething elſe to attend to beſides his reputation; I mean his belly.—The uſual means of ſubſiſtence had failed: he was no longer a *great* Repreſentative of a *great* and *free* people.

people. The handful of aſſignats he received daily were gone to ſome more ſtaunch patriot, and the old Rights of Man was left to dine where he could. As to political drugs, Thomas's were grown out of vogue in France, as much as they now are in this country; his Conſtitution was declared to be the moſt ſtupid performance that ever iſſued from a ſick brain, and its author fell into diſcredit as rapidly as he had riſen to fame *. Among thouſands of others, he experienced the ſudden change in the opinions of the volatile Pariſians: from being a ſort of demi-god, he was become the moſt degraded thing in nature, a poor, half-ſtarved, deſpiſed pretender to renown. Beſides, the Conſtitution that was now coming into play, with a Council of Youngſters, and a Council of Elders, and five Kings, elected by *people of ſome property*, or, at leaſt, ſome *qualification*, was what Tom never could defend with his right of univerſal ſuffrage and continual inſurrection; and, for once, he had the prudence to hold his tongue.

Tom's fate in France was nearly what it had been in America; when it was no longer neceſſary to employ him, he ſunk into neglect. Happy if he could have ceaſed eating when his inſurrection talents became uſeleſs; but as he could not, he muſt continue to write: and as he was in a country where he was permitted to revile none but the Almighty, the Almighty he reviled. The preſent of poiſon he has ſent to his "fellow-citizens" of America, is not therefore ſo much the work of choice as of neceſſity. The Second Part of the Age of Reaſon he wrote for a living, and the Firſt Part he wrote for his life.

---

* *Inſurrection*, *revolution*, *conſtitution*, a knowledge in all theſe ſeems to be a neceſſary qualification in a profeſſor of the *Rights of Man*. Tom Paine underſtood the firſt perfectly well; he had a ſmattering of the ſecond; but as to the third, he was, and if alive is, totally ignorant.

Thoſe

Thoſe who prefer a few years of life to every thing elſe, may find an excuſe for this degraded man: it is impoſſible for any of us to ſay how we ſhould act at the foot of the guillotine. But what ſhall be ſaid to thoſe, who, preſſed by neither danger nor want, make uncommon exertions to ſpread his infamous performance among the ignorant part of their countrymen, and thereby ſow in their minds the ſeeds of vice, inquietude, and deſpair? Again; deiſts may find ſome apology for doing this; but who will dare to become the apologiſt of thoſe bookſellers, who, profeſſors of the Chriſtian faith, throw out this bait of blaſphemy to catch unwary comers, and, ſmiling at their ſimplicity, pocket the dirty pence? Such men (and they are but too numerous) are like the Hollander on the coaſt of Japan, who, to outſtrip others in trade with the natives, tramples on the croſs of his Saviour *.

Epitaph on Tom Paine †.

When the wight who here lies beneath the cold earth,
Firſt quitted the land that had given him birth,
He commenc'd the apoſtle of bloodſhed and ſtrife,
And practis'd the trade to the end of his life.
Sedition and nonſenſe and lies to diſpenſe,
He took up the title of "*Old Common Senſe*;"
Taught poor honeſt men how rich rogues to keep under,
Excited to pillage, and ſhar'd in the plunder;
But when there no longer was plunder to ſhare,
His "common ſenſe" led him to ſeek it elſewhere.
To his countrymen now he return'd back again,
The wronger of rights and the *righter of men*;

---

* I know a printer and bookſeller who has taken for his ſign the picture of the blaſphemer Paine. This undoubtedly is to inform the *amateurs* of inſurrection and infidelity that they may be ſupplied within. It is no more than fair to impute this intention to him who hangs out ſuch a ſign. When *Katterfelto* placed the picture of the Devil over his door, it was to inform people that hell was to be ſeen in his houſe.

† At the time this was written it was generally believed that Paine was dead.

He

He told them they ſtill were a nation of ſlaves,
That their king was a fool, and his miniſters knaves;
And the only ſure way for the people to thrive
Was to leave neither one nor the other alive.
But Thomas, who never knew when he ſhould ſtop,
Went a little too far, and was catch'd on the hop.
In ſhort, 't was determin'd that poor Tom ſhould loſe
His ears at a poſt, or his life in a nooſe.
" Old Common Senſe" boggles, then ſkulks out of ſight,
Then packs up his rags and decamps in the night.
His arrival at Paris occaſions a fête,
And he finds in the den of aſſaſſins a ſeat.
Here he murders, and thieves, and makes laws for a ſeaſon;
Is cramm'd in a dungeon, and preaches up—" *Reaſon*;"
Blaſphemes the Almighty, lives in filth like a hog,
Is abandon'd in death, and interr'd like a dog.
Tom Paine for the Devil is ſurely a match:
In hanging Old England he cheated Jack-Catch;
In France (the firſt time ſuch a thing had been ſeen)
He cheated the watchful and ſharp Guillotine;
And at laſt, to the ſorrow of all the beholders,
He march'd out of life with his head on his ſhoulders.

French Generoſity.

On the 27th of April laſt, there appeared, in the Philadelphia Gazette, an order, ſaid to be iſſued by the French Convention (I lump the five Kings and Council of old ones and Council of young ones all together), to the commanders of their privateers, concerning the papers of Mr. *Spillard*, the famous traveller. The perſon who ſends this article to Mr. *Brown*, requeſts him to publiſh it, as " it will be " acceptable to *every friend of the French nation*, and " of *uſeful diſcoveries*."

Before we ſay any thing about the order itſelf, we ought to obſerve, that it is publiſhed to give pleaſure to the friends of the French, by extolling French *generoſity*. The friends of *uſeful diſcoveries* too are to be obliged; and the paragraphiſt ſeems to hint, that thoſe who are friends of the latter muſt be of the former. I muſt allow that the French have made

made ſeveral *new* diſcoveries, as, for inſtance, forced loans, aſſignats, the maximum, requiſitions, revolutionary tribunals, feſtivals to Reaſon, drowning-boats, ſhooting *en maſſe*, and the renowned guillotine. While *Spillard* has been employed in exploring the back parts of America, the French have been employed in exploring both back and belly parts of the human body: they have been cutting off the breaſts of women and ſecrets of men; they have been tearing out the heart from the breaſt, and the embryo from the womb. Theſe are certainly diſcoveries; but, I imagine, the "friends of France" alone will think them "*uſeful*" ones.

Now to the *generous* order. After having run on a long while, in the uſual bombaſtical cant of the Convention (but with *leſs vaunting* than formerly), the order ſays:

"As a philoſophical traveller, he knew the "chances of war: he knew how *formidable the cou-* "*rage of the French was*. By venturing on ſea to "reach his country, he undoubtedly puts his con- "fidence in the *generoſity* of a *great republic*, found- "ed upon the love of *virtue*, the *ſciences*, and *arts*.

"No, *Spillard*'s hope ſhall not be in vain; and "to have recapitulated here his intereſting labours, "is ſufficient to be convinced of the readineſs of his "captors to aſſiſt the views of the Government. That "is a debt which they will acquit in the name of "the Republic, a *great leſſon* which they will give *to* "*our enemies*, and a great claim to the glory which "they will acquire; for a *good action* deſerves as "much as a great victory."

The Convention could not, all at once, leave off their old ſtyle. We muſt yet be dunned with the *formidableneſs of French courage*; and poor *Spillard* muſt be called a *philoſopher*, a name now ſynonymous with cut-throat. They muſt yet keep up their cant about a *great republic*, and their love of *virtue* and

and of the *arts* and *ſciences*. We have indeed ſeen ſome few inſtances of the force of their genius, and of their application, in the *diſcoveries* above enumerated; but how long is it, I would be glad to know, ſince they have become the patrons and protectors of the *arts* and *ſciences?*

I have a book lying before me from which I ſhall here borrow a fact or two. The library at Anecy was crammed into hogſheads; at Narbonne the books were ſent to the arſenal; at Fontaine le Dijon the library of the Feuillants was thrown aſide as waſte paper. Many of the libraries of monks contained editions printed in the firſt days of the art of printing; books, ſold in France for a few crowns, were ſold in London for 125 guineas. A clock *en malachite* was ſold for a trifle, though the only one exiſting. They mutilated or deſtroyed all the famous ſtatues, one in particular that coſt 200,000 livres. At Pont Mouſſon, a large picture, which connoiſſeurs offered to cover with guineas as its price, was ſold for leſs than two. At Nancy, in the ſpace of a few hours, they broke and burned to the value of 100,000 crowns in books and pictures. At Lyons 800 antique medals of gold were thrown into the crucible. The antiquities of Arles were deſtroyed to come at ſaltpetre.

One member of this Vandal Convention propoſed to deſtroy the portal of St. Denis; another wanted to kill all the rare animals in the Muſeum of Natural Hiſtory; a third ſaid he did not like learned men, and that the term was ſynonymous with ariſtocrat; a fourth propoſed, that ſoldiers might be promoted to generals, without being able to write: to conclude, one of theſe monſters ſaid, that *all men of genius ſhould be guillotined.*

Theſe are lovers of the arts and ſciences! Theſe are the Repreſentatives of that *great* republic to whoſe

whoſe *generous* forbearance *Spillard* is to owe the recovery of his papers. Amazing change! Theſe people, who burnt *Horace* and *Virgil* becauſe they had been encouraged by kings, and who deſtroyed the *royal* library, merely becauſe it was royal, are now uſing their utmoſt endeavours to preſerve the papers of *Spillard* for the uſe of a *king*, and, oh ye gods! for a King of England too!—a "deſpot," with whom they were "never to make peace, till "he begged it on his knees, with a halter about his "neck!"

Kind, forgiving, *generous* fellows! How are they reformed! They who, in the beginning of the war, ſeized on the property, even to the very clothes, of all the Britiſh ſubjects who happened to be in France, and threw their perſons into loathſome priſons, where hundreds of them periſhed; they who, *in the days of their ſucceſs*, iſſued a decree for murdering every Briton taken in the field of action; they, whoſe cannibal agents dug the half-rotten body of the brave *General Dundas* from the grave, and hung it on a gibbet—yes, theſe very people are now uncommonly ſolicitous to ſave, for an Engliſh gentleman, the little memorandums he may have made in his travels!

How ſhall we poſſibly account for all this? Let us ſee if the cloſing ſentence of the extract I have given from their order, will not throw ſome light on the matter. "This will," ſay they, "give a "*great leſſon to our enemies*; for a *good action* deſerves "as much as a *great victory*." So, ſo; daddy *Merlin* is coming round, is he? A great leſſon of *generoſity* is to be given to their enemies, and this good action is to yield them as much as a great victory? This is what you may call coaxing. No, no; none of your good actions; keep them for your friends, and your great victories for your enemies.

And

And do I live to ſee the *Grande Convention Françoiſe* wheedling "the *nation of ſhopkeepers?*"—the people of that devoted Carthage, which they promiſed us they would deſtroy! They may wheedle long enough: Pitt has not forgotten that his head was to be brought before them, as a preliminary to any peace they might *grant* to the "ſhopkeeping "nation:" he has not forgotten that they guillotined him in effigy along with his Royal Maſter.

When the reader compares their *patronage* of the arts and ſciences, in their own country, and their *generoſity* ſhown towards the Engliſh, in their proſperous days, with their *pretended* motives ſet forth in this generous order, I am perſuaded he will attribute their change of conduct to the proper cauſe.

Pray, then, Mr. Brown, the Gazette-man, let us hear no more of your French generoſity. For ſhame, Sir! how can you ſuffer your fine large Gazette to talk about French virtue? Tell your correſpondent, if he ſhould peſter you with ſuch another paragraph, that the bore is diſcovered; tell him that the "friends "of France" are very much reduced in numbers, and are daily and hourly decreaſing. Tell him, above all, that nothing can keep the ſans-culotte cauſe alive but an immediate ſupply of the ready; that the "friends of France" are not to be ſatisfied with mere ſounds of *generoſity*; that fraternity and flattery go but little way at the ſhambles or the grog-ſhop; and that, in ſhort, flour-merchants or not flour-merchants, they all prefer "ſolid pud-"ding to empty praiſe."

Remarks on the poetical Works of John Swanwick of Philadelphia.

In the laſt Cenſor I made my readers a ſort of half promiſe to give them ſome account of the poeti-

cal works of Mr. Swanwick; and I am now preparing to fulfil it.

These works are as yet confined to a poem, which is to be found in the Gentleman's Magazine for June, 1795, published by *Sylvanus Urban*, of the city of London. The reader will be surprised that a poem, written in Philadelphia, should be exported to England for publication: I was and am yet surprised at this; and still more, that *Citizen* Swanwick should send his works to the editor of a *Gentleman*'s Magazine. He had heard, I presume, that this is the repository of most of the little fugitive pieces written by men of learning and genius, and so he condescended to enrich it with a piece of his own. This was certainly generous in him, if we recollect what a hatred he has for all that is *gentlemanlike.*

The poem is entitled, "The Prospect of seeing "the Fine Arts flourish in America." After having spoken of the epoch when the artists of America shall stay at home "to finish the glories of the "risen day of Columbia," our author, by a happy transition, turns our eyes to what we already possess:

"But see what *flowrets* we already claim,
"What lovely *harbingers* of future fame!
"Behold *philosophy*'s bright temple rise,
"And fanes to learning every where surprise;
"What *schemes of charity* the soul excite
"To acts of bounty and unmix'd delight!
"Some *to the jail with pitying steps repair*,
"To minister to *woes* that *languish* there;
"Others *the bed of raging illness smooth*,
"And the worst pangs of human *sorrow sooth.*"

Thus, then, *schemes of charity*, *visiting the jail*, and *ministering to the sick*, are, by Mr. Swanwick, called "*flowrets*, the lovely *harbingers* of fame;" and hence are to spring the *fine arts*. Never did I before

fore hear that *poor-houſes*, *jails*, and *ſick-beds* were places for cultivating or encouraging the *fine arts*. Mr. Swanwick may there practiſe fine arts, perhaps ſuch as are neceſſary to gain him votes at an election; theſe are very fine arts indeed. But ſtop; there are more of theſe arts to come yet:

" Some to fair Freedom *living altars raiſe*,
" And bid *the negro* celebrate her praiſe;
" Others the *farmer* with their cares embrace,
" And pay due homage to his uſeful race;
" Some *manufacturers and their arts* protect,
" Others *humane* eſtabliſhments erect.
" But ceaſe the *Muſe!*——"

Our poet alludes to the *Negro Society*, or Abolition Society, as it is called; and I am ready to allow it a place among the harbingers of the fine arts. This ſociety is, indeed, a nurſery for ſome of the fineſt arts ever practiſed either in Europe or America. But how comes our author to number *farming* and *manufacturing* among his fine arts? Ploughing and grubbing, and making anchors and cables, or grinding ſnuff, or boiling up ſugar; theſe do not ſeem to me to be *fine* arts. After theſe come " *humane eſtabliſh-*
" *ments*;" and, though theſe had been before enumerated, Mr. Swanwick muſt thus ſum them up together, and expreſs them over again, for fear we ſhould imagine that he did not look on them as mere tricks of art. Mercy on us! Who ever heard before, that *humane* eſtabliſhments were among the hot-beds of the fine arts?

So much for the vein of abſurdity running through this metre—now to the nonſenſe.

Miniſtering to *woes* may be a fine art; but when we are told that theſe woes *languiſh*, what are we to think of the fine artiſt? To *languiſh* is to *pine away*, to *droop*, to *ſink under affliction*. Now, can it be ſaid that a woe *pines* and *droops*? Let us change

the principal words in this line for ſuch as are ſynonymous with them, but rather more familiar, and we ſhall be ſtruck, nay, knocked down with the nonſenſe—

"To *ſuccour pains* that *pine* in the jail."

I could ſay ſomething about the *raging* illneſs of *ſorrow*, and ſorrow *ſtretched upon a bed* too; but I haſten on to the *living altars* of Freedom. The poet tells us, that the Slave Society raiſe living altars to Freedom, and then bid *the negroes* celebrate her praiſe. Now, what are theſe *living altars?* Why, the perſons freed, *the negroes themſelves*; and ſo, theſe kind gentlemen bid *the altars praiſe the goddeſs!* They will ſtand in no need of prieſts, at any rate.

With reſpect to the *farmer*, I will leave it to the experience and good ſenſe of the reader to determine, whether it be either uſual or fitting to *pay homage* to the race of him *whom we have taken under our care and patronage.* Our poet often makes uſe of figures of rhetoric, but that of the *gallimatia* is the only one he has perfectly at command. It requires neither learning nor taſte to diſcover that he has a plentiful lack of both.

Butler, in remarking on the verſes of the would-be poets of his time, ſays they made one line for *ſenſe* and one for *rhyme.* It is certain that this is a moſt ſure mark of ſterility; but our little man goes a ſtep further, or rather falls a ſtep ſhort, of this: he has one line for *rhyme*, and the other for nonſenſe.

This piece of rhyming proſe I do not ſcruple to pronounce the moſt miſerable attempt at verſification that ever appeared in the Gentleman's Magazine; nor can I perſuade myſelf that the editor would ever have admitted it without a *douceur.* It

appeared,

appeared, indeed, to have experienced ſome conſiderable delay; for it is dated in 1788. Certain I am, that if old Sylvanus Urban had been acquainted with our little author's principles in politics, he never would have ſuffered his chiming to enter his repoſitory.

Had this piece been ſcratched out in a hurry, and ſent away to the newſpaper, one might have winked at its faults, one might have yawned over its inſipidity, and thrown it aſide; but here is a ſtudied trap for fame; this poor dull morſel had been copied over a hundred times, perhaps, before it was ſent all the way to Old England. I think I ſee the little poet now, ſcratching his head and gnawing his pen, telling his fingers and ſearching his rhyme-book. Alas! Mr. Swanwick, people do not make poetry this way. They may hammer out lines till they clink; but as to poetry, it never was hammered out of a dull brain.

What is moſt laughable, is, to hear the little man calling out upon the *Muſe*—"But ceaſe the *Muſe!*" As much as to ſay that the *Muſe* had inſpired the ſmall-beer verſes we have above extracted! It is with rapture I hear Milton invoke the heavenly Muſe, or Shakeſpeare wiſhing for a Muſe of fire; but when, at the end of fifty lines of vapid metre, I hear the little whiffling poetaſter calling on his Muſe to ceaſe her courſe, a ſneer contracts the muſcles of my noſe, in ſpite of all my complaiſance and compaſſion.

If Mr. Swanwick reckons the noble art, taught by the famous *Martinus Scriblerus*, I mean the *art of ſinking in poetry*; if he reckons this among the fine arts, I congratulate him on having brought it to perfection, for he has certainly rolled from the very bottommoſt ſtep of the *Bathos*.

Thus it is to be a pretender to univerſal genius, without having any genius at all. Inſtead of getting

ting renown, a man gets himſelf laughed at. It is a real misfortune. Mr. Swanwick might have been happy all his days as a *tide-waiter*; but, from his dabbling in a variety of *arts* for which he is not calculated, he will moſt probably preſerve through life that character ſo deſpicable among partiſans—"a *Jack* of all trades, and *maſter* of none."

French Fraternity.

Since the autumn of 1793, we have heard talk about little elſe than Britiſh depredations on the American commerce. Moſt of the newſpapers have been crammed with philippics againſt the Britiſh Government on this account; the nation have been called thieves, and their King the great ſea-robber. This was not very decent language; but even this was ſurpaſſed by certain members of Congreſs, who ſeemed to vie with each other in the uſe of that ſort of rhetoric uſually called *Billingſgate*. I have their ſpeeches now before me, but the extracts I would wiſh to give from them are too lengthy, and I ſhould be ſorry to mutilate ſuch elegant compoſitions.

I am the laſt on earth that would attempt to juſtify injuſtice; I cannot therefore be thought to approve of the depredations of the Britiſh; but at the ſame time I know they have been a thouſand times falſely accuſed, that every art has been made uſe of to exaggerate their violences, that the number of veſſels taken by them has been counted fifty times over, and that language has been imputed to them which they never held.

Nor can the Britiſh be juſtified by ſaying that they have done no more than imitate the French; but we muſt be permitted to wonder that the depredations of one nation ſhould excite ſuch a lively reſentment as to puſh the country within a hair's breadth

breadth of a war, while equal depredations on the part of France ſhould excite not the leaſt diſcontent, except among the merchants immediately feeling the loſs. At the very moment that the members of Congreſs were execrating the ſea-robbers of Britain, and ordering General Confiſcation and Admiral Embargo to take up arms againſt them; at this very moment the depredations of our dear, generous, *humane*, and *pure-fingered* allies had committed greater havoc and acts of diſhoneſty than "the King of pirates" (to uſe a legiſlative expreſſion) or his ſubjects had ever done. I have in another work quoted the Report delivered to the Houſe of Repreſentatives on this ſubject, ſtating "that the French had not only "been guilty of *depredations equal to thoſe of* the Bri- "tiſh, but that they had, beſides, violated the "treaty between the two countries, and had, "moreover, cheated the American merchants by "diſcharging in depreciated aſſignats a contract "which ſhould have been diſcharged in coin."

When this Report came to be examined, every *uncorrupted* man was aſtoniſhed to hear members fall upon the Britiſh tooth and nail, while they were ready to give the *baiſer fraternel* to the robbing Carmagnoles. One ſaid, that as to the depredations of France, "*ſome allowance* muſt be made for a great "nation, combatting in the *cauſe of liberty*, and that "*he made no doubt* that magnanimous people would "be ready to make every juſt compenſation." This was the reaſoning of thoſe times, and ſo an Envoy was ſent to obtain redreſs from Britain, and which by the treaty is obtained; but ſome allowance was made for the *great* nation who was fighting in the cauſe of liberty, and therefore all account againſt her died away.

The merchants, however, though generally partial enough towards the *grande Republique*, ſtill recollected the loſs which has been ever ſince increaſing.

Theſe men are too well acquainted with book-keeping to be real good republicans *à la Françoiſe*. They were as ready as any body "*to make ſome allowances*" for the exceſſes of the French, provided always that thoſe allowances did not come out of their pockets. Their exceſſes in the Low Countries, their robbing of the merchants at Amſterdam, ſet the bells to ringing at Philadelphia; but when they came to lay their fraternal fingers on the Philadelphians themſelves, oh! then they were ſad rogues, and ſo the merchants ſend a Memorial to Congreſs.—Now we ſhall hear their own hiſtory of the affair.

"*The Memorial, &c. reſpectfully ſhoweth,*

"That the Memorialiſts, and divers others in the "regular courſe of their trade in the years 1793, "1794, and 1795, inveſted large ſums of money in "proviſions and other merchandiſes ſuited to the "Weſt Indian market, and ſent them thither, where "many cargoes were ſold to the officers of Colonial "Adminiſtration of the Republic of France, to be "paid for in caſh or colonial produce; many others "were taken by force by the ſaid officers, from the "ſupercargoes and conſignees, at *prices arbitrarily "fixed by themſelves*, to be paid for in produce at rates "and terms of credit fixed at their pleaſure; and "that *others have been arreſted on the high ſeas*, car-"ried into their ports, and taken for the uſe of the "Republic, without any ſtipulated price or contract; "that your Memorialiſts confidently believe that "the amount of property belonging to the citizens "of the United States, thus delivered to and taken "by the adminiſtrative bodies of the French Repub-"lic in the Weſt Indies, *exceeds two millions of dol-"lars now in arrear*, for which your Memorialiſts "and others concerned have no mode of obtaining "payment, ſatisfaction, or redreſs. That the uſual "courſe is, after taking the cargo by force and

"dureſs,

" dureſs, to detain the veſſels under pretence of pay-
" ing in produce, until the maſters and crews are
" wearied with idleneſs, ſickneſs, delay, *and inſult*,
" ſo as to be willing to return either altogether with-
" out pay, or with ſuch ſmall portions thereof, as
" ſcarcely to pay the freight and charges occaſioned
" by theſe long delays; whereby in moſt inſtances
" the whole capital has been left behind; and in
" thoſe inſtances where a conſiderable part of the
" cargo has been paid for in colonial produce, the
" expenſes of demurrage have conſumed almoſt the
" whole, as by vouchers ready to be laid before the
" Houſe or a Committee thereof will abundantly ap-
" pear.

" Your Memorialiſts further ſhow, that ſome of
" the earlieſt ſufferers among them applied perſon-
" ally and by memorials to *Citizens Genet*, *Fauchet*,
" and *Adet*, *the firſt and ſucceeding Miniſters of the*
" *French Republic*, *for redreſs*, *without obtaining it.*
" They alſo applied by memorial to the Preſident
" of the United States, who referred them to the
" Secretary for the department of State, whoſe ad-
" vice they purſued in committing their claims to
" James Monroe, Eſq. Miniſter Plenipotentiary of
" the United States to the Republic of France, at
" the time of his embarkation. That although your
" Memorialiſts are perfectly ſatisfied that the exe-
" cutive authority of the Union hath done all with-
" in its power to procure redreſs to your Memorial-
" iſts, yet it has not had the deſired effect.

" Your Memorialiſts further repreſent that they
" had hoped that ſome arrangement would have
" been aſſented to, whereby the debt due from the
" Republic of France to the citizens of America
" might have been diſcharged out of the debt due
" to her from the United States, and under this
" expectation they *exerciſed patience*; but finding
" that money funded and *transferred to an agent of*

" *the Republic*, all hope from that reſource is va-
" niſhed.

" Your Memorialiſts feel the more concern, that " while *proviſion has been made by the Executive of the* " *Union for obtaining from other nations* a *redreſs for* " *ſpoliations* committed on their commerce, no mea- " ſures adopted have been ſucceſsful for procuring " ſimilar ſatisfaction from that nation which the " merchants of this have ſhown *ſo decided an affection* " *to*, by ſupplying their iſlands with proviſions and " neceſſaries at a *greater riſk than attended any other* " *branch of their trade*—ſupplies that were abſolutely " neceſſary to their colonies, and which they could " from no other place nor in any other manner be " furniſhed with.

" Your Memorialiſts therefore pray that the Le- " giſlature will take their ſuffering caſe into conſi- " deration, and afford them ſuch relief and protec- " tion as to their wiſdom ſhall ſeem conſiſtent with " right and juſtice."

Some people will pity and others will laugh at theſe Memorialiſts: the French republicans will be among the latter. Upon my word, it was very cruel of our dear allies: after having received ſuch proofs of our " ſo *decided affection*," to cheat and inſult us even more than the " great ſea-robber" did! After the patriotic and affectionate captains had run the gauntlet, as it were, to get into the ports of their dear friends and allies to ſave them from ſtarving, how ſilly they muſt look to have their cargoes ſeized, and be themſelves thrown into a dungeon! This was often the caſe. I have once before ſaid that the Carmagnoles called them, *les capitaines à coup de bâton*, or *caned captains*; juſt as their Convention called the Pruſſians, *les ſoldats à coup de bâton*, or *caned ſoldiers*. Indeed they did often beat and kick theſe captains; and though the poet tells us that ſuch kind of blows wound honour more than any other, yet we have never heard this called a national diſ-

grace:

grace: on the contrary, the more theſe fellows were kicked, the louder did they cry *Long live the Republic!* and the more lies did they bring us in her favour.

The hearts of the patriots at home partook of the inſenſibility of the backs and poſteriors of the gallant mariners; and had it not been for this after-clap Memorial of the merchants, the whole would have ſunk into oblivion.

Some perſons of extraordinary patriotiſm went ſo far as to apologize for the conduct of the French; as thus: "The mother-country, engaged in combat-" ting deſpotiſm at home, and endeavouring to calm " thoſe troubles which exiſt in her boſom, cannot " pay ſufficient attention to the filling the offices in " the iſlands with honeſt and upright characters, " otherwiſe they certainly would not ſuffer the con-" duct purſued. This is proved by the *honourable* " *and very ample payment for damages and demurrage* " *made to Americans detained in their ports.* They " are therefore not implicated in the charge of de-" predation." (See the *Aurora* of 28th May, 1795.)

Now Great Britain was at war in Europe as well as France was; why then was not the ſame apology applicable to her? But this apologiſt ſays, that *ample payment was made for damages*, &c. If this be true, the Memorialiſts are miſtaken, for they ſay there are *two millions* of dollars yet unpaid in May, 1796. I know very well that the French promiſed to pay amply: I recollect that when Mr. Randolph's Report (the ſubſtance of which I have above noticed) was publiſhed, it was accompanied with a note from his *intimate friend* Fauchet, declaring the readineſs of the French Republic to make immediate compenſation. This had the deſired effect; for though a ſingle farthing will never be paid, the declaration was looked upon as an acknowledgment of the debt, and as a ſecurity for the future; while the Engliſh Miniſter, not daring to make a promiſe which he

was

was not ſure would be fulfilled, was obliged to remain ſilent, and his ſilence was conſidered as a proof that his court not only authorized, but was reſolved to continue its depredations. But how deceitful are appearances! He that promiſes every thing pays nothing, and he that promiſes nothing pays every thing.

Either the apologiſt tells us a falſehood, or the merchants tell us one. I have no great inclination to interfere with the matter: I leave them to ſettle it between themſelves; or if they ſhould be obliged to call in an umpire, none is ſo proper as the dear nation for whom they both have "ſhown ſo decided "an affection."

New Diſcoveries in the Regions of Corruption.

In the introduction to this work, I promiſed the public "to give an account of every democratic "trick, whether of native growth or imported from "abroad, to unravel all the windings of the pre-"tended patriots, and more particularly thoſe of the "*flour-merchants*." Under this engagement, I ſhould think myſelf inexcuſable, were I to remain ſilent at a time when, if new plots are not abſolutely diſcovered, ſuch are talked of in a manner calculated to excite general curioſity.

Satisfied in my own mind, as I have long been in the habit of declaring, that there is a numerous faction in this country acting under French influence, and even in French pay, I muſt naturally rejoice at the diſcovery of whatever promiſes to be more ſucceſsful than any thing I have hitherto been able to ſay in convincing the people of the exiſtence of this faction. Under this impreſſion it is that I publiſh the following article from the *Minerva* of New-York, and that I add ſuch obſervations as appear to me pertinent.

Extract

Extract of a Letter from an American, dated Paris, Feb. 14, 1796.

" Could you imagine, my dear Sir, that any American citizens could be so abandoned as to invite " France to attempt, by coercion, to prevent the " free exercise of the judgment of our country concerning its own interests, and to awe it into a surrender of its own opinion to the mandate of a foreign country? Yet so the fact undoubtedly is.— " *Influential men on your side of the water have invited the French Government to speak to ours a decided language against the execution of the treaty with Great Britain, and even to go so far as to claim our guarantee of the French West Indies; placing before us the alternative of war with France or Great Britain.* The idea has been listened to by the Government, and it has been in contemplation to " send a new Minister with a fleet to carry the plan " into effect: though I am inclined to hope that " it has been recently laid aside. The extreme embarrassments of the affairs of their country, especially with regard to its finances, and more serious reflections on the hazard of driving us into " an election to take side with Great Britain, as " well from the exposed state of our commerce, " as from the resentment which so dictatorial a conduct would naturally inspire, have at last produced " a halt; and I trust that the hesitation which has " begun, will end in a resolution not to risk so unjust and so mad a proceeding. Would to heaven " that the war was at an end! For we shall not be " safe from the machinations of this wicked portion " of the globe till that event takes place. Justice " and morality have fled from Europe—but, alas! " are they flying from America also? *I dare not " trust to this mode of conveyance the persons supposed to " be the authors of this nefarious plot.* But a few " months

" months may enable me to make the diſcloſure " with more certainty, *where I can do it with perfect* " *ſafety.*"

This intelligence, if true, at once decides the queſtion of French influence and corruption; it is therefore of the utmoſt importance to form a correct opinion concerning it. Let us firſt ſee what claims the letter itſelf has to authenticity, and then whether the alarming information it contains be corroborated by facts already known.

The Gazette in which this extract firſt appeared is remarkable for its impartiality. The editor is a man of much experience in his buſineſs, and enjoys a high reputation for candour and underſtanding. It is not probable that ſuch a man ſhould be deceived with reſpect to the authenticity of the letter, and it is ſtill leſs probable, that he ſhould be prevailed on to print it, not believing it authentic. The manner, too, in which he introduces it to the public, ſeems to me to be a ſtrong proof of his perſuaſion, that it would be ſoon followed up with a more explicit account. Indeed, had he not believed that the whole affair muſt finally come to light, it is hardly credible that he would have hazarded a piece of intelligence reflecting ſuch indelible diſhonour on a portion of his countrymen, and not capable of anſwering any good purpoſe whatever.

The editor has never ſhown himſelf the enemy of France. He has not, indeed, like hundreds of others, approved of the maſſacres in that country; but the inſtant thoſe maſſacres ceaſed, he contributed his dole of praiſe to the triumphant *moderates.*— He was among the firſt to oppoſe the principles of the preſent Conſtitution in France to thoſe of our Jacobins; and though he was miſtaken here, though he was oppoſing miſchief to miſchief, the miſtake proves that the preſent French Government had his approbation; and as it ſtill continues the ſame, it muſt ſtill have

have that approbation. There is then no reaſon to ſuppoſe that he would lend his hand to a fabrication tending to diſcredit the French Government. In truth, he is over-cautious in ſpeaking of it. If the intelligence be true, the hardeſt terms he has for the conduct of ſuch an infamous and treacherous nature are, "*unkindneſs and imprudence.*" A man who could ſo far get the better of the feelings he muſt entertain upon the ſight of this intelligence, is rather to be ſuſpected of a partiality for, than againſt the French Government.

The editor of the *Minerva* has, 't is true, been a bold and able defender of the Britiſh treaty; he might therefore be ſuppoſed to be anxious for its ſucceſs, as all men are zealous in a cauſe they have decidedly eſpouſed; but this cauſe ſtood no longer in need of ſupport when the extract appeared, the treaty having paſſed the Houſe of Repreſentatives ſixteen days before. Had this intelligence been a mere invention to ſtir the people up againſt the Oppoſition, or rather againſt their deſtructive projects, it ſhould have made its appearance at the time when petitions were handing about for and againſt the treaty. At that time ſuch a battery might have been opened to good purpoſe; but after the treaty was ſanctioned, it would have been playing it off upon the defeated and the dead.

In ſhort, there is no reaſon whatever to ſuppoſe, that the editor would have publiſhed the extract, believing it a fabrication; and as it is almoſt impoſſible he ſhould be duped by any fabricator, we muſt believe it authentic, eſpecially when we ſee the intelligence contained in it ſtrongly corroborated by facts already moſt clearly and unequivocally aſcertained.

It is certain that every American who loves his country, and who conſequently feels a deep concern

for its honour, muſt be fired with indignation upon hearing that "certain influential men on this ſide of "the water had invited the French Government to "*force* the Government of America to ſet aſide the "treaty, and that the French rulers had liſtened to "the propoſal;" but the editor of the *Minerva* muſt excuſe me, if I think it rather ſurpriſing, that he ſhould imagine either one or the other "impoſſible." Says he, "It ſeems impoſſible that any American "Citizens ſhould be ſo loſt to all ſenſe of virtue "and duty, as to endeavour to bring upon their "country ſo great an evil; and it ſeems leſs pro-"bable, that the Government of France ſhould ſo "far forget our rights as an independent nation, "and be ſo unmindful of the ſpirit and genius of "freedom, as to be diſpoſed to follow the pernicious "advice." Now the truth is, that what is here repreſented as next to impoſſible, is no more than a continuation of what we have been witneſſes of during four ſucceſſive years.

In order to form a correct opinion as to the probability of the truth of the intelligence from Paris, we muſt go back to the epoch when the ruinous and ruined French nation was firſt *called* a Republic*, and trace down the chain of the machinations of its tyrants to the moment when the hoſtile determination, the *ne plus ultra* of impudence and of perfidy, is ſaid to have been formed.

When *Briſſot* and his colleagues declared war againſt Great Britain, Holland, and Spain, they formed the plan of forcing this country to make a common cauſe with them. For this purpoſe Citizen Genet was ſent out to replace Mr. Ternant, bringing with him the neceſſary inſtructions, and the

* I ſay *called*, becauſe France is no more a Republic in reality than Turkey or Morocco, or any other deſpotic ſtate.

ſtill

ſtill more neceſſary *rouleaux of louis-d'ors**. As it was foreſeen that the Executive of the United States would reſolutely oppoſe the overtures for war, Genet was to effect by force what could not be effected by perſuaſion. If the Government of America was ready to aid the cauſe of France, it was to be reſpected, but if not, it was to be deſtroyed by ſtirring up the people to oppoſition.

Inſtead, therefore, of coming directly to the ſeat of Government, the Citizen landed at one of the ports the moſt diſtant from it, and in a part of the Union the moſt likely to be led aſtray by his ſeductive and ſeditious arts. On his arrival he found a proclamation of neutrality, ſtrictly forbidding the people of theſe States to do any thing contrary to their duty as a nation at peace with all the world; but, in place of acknowledging this right of a neutral nation, what did he do? He iſſued letters of marque and military commiſſions: by ſea he ſent Americans to cruiſe on the Britiſh, and by land to invade the Spaniſh dominions. His journey through the ſouthern States was a kind of triumphal proceſſion, and he at laſt made his public entry at Philadelphia more like a viceroy or a conqueror than a foreign miniſter.

His introductory letter to the Secretary of State was a clear declaration of his intentions. "When," ſays he, "the emiſſaries of our *common enemies* are "making *uſeleſs efforts* to *neutralize* the gratitude of "your fellow-citizens," &c. This language was an unequivocal proof that he deſpiſed the Preſident

---

* Some time ago I had a note ſent me, giving an account of the depoſit as well as the removal of certain *rouleaux*, accompanied with a poem, entitled, "The Confeſſions of *François Louis-* "*d'or*." The author has my thanks for both; but want of room has delayed their publication for the preſent.

and his proclamation of neutrality, and that he depended on the people for ſupport. Accordingly, his endeavours were all directed towards this one object, exciting diſcontent and diſobedience.

Thoſe who had ſucceeded in deſtroying one Government by the infernal agency of Jacobin clubs, knew their utility too well to neglect employing them againſt another. The Jacobins had hurled the King of France from his throne, and the democrats might hurl General Waſhington from his chair. It is ſomething truly ſingular, that a celebrated *aſtronomer* and a *Secretary of State*, ſhould be the *Preſident* and *Secretary* of the mother-club in each country; it is, however, a fact, *Bailly* and *Dumouriez* once filled thoſe honourable poſts in France, as *David Rittenhouſe* and *A. J. Dallas* did in the firſt club that was formed in America.

On the plan, and at the recommendation of the mother-club at Philadelphia, others were formed all over the Union. Their affiliations were as perfect in their nature as thoſe of the Jacobins in France, or of the reformers in England and Scotland, and the principles and object of all were the ſame. It would be tedious to enter into a detail of their manœuvres, and diſagreeable alſo, as it would not fail to bring to mind the conduct of many perſons who now with their folly to be forgotten.

When the Citizen ſaw that the clubs were become numerous, and thought that things were ripe, he made an open avowal of his intentions of "appealing from the Preſident to the people." This precipitant avowal, dictated by French vanity, happily diſconcerted all his plans. The hectoring Miniſter was miſtaken; he thought he had the poor doltiſh Pariſians to deal with, but he was ſoon convinced of the contrary. The people of America, though their partiality for the French nation, and their ſtill

greater

greater partiality for what they *then* imagined to be the cauſe of freedom, had led them into innumerable fooleries, and diſtinctions as unwiſe as unjuſt, ſhowed, when it came to the trial, that they had too much love for their country, and for their friend and father, to eſpouſe the cauſe of a man who aimed at the deſtruction of both *.

From the moment the inſolent Briſſotonian found himſelf baffled, his myrmidons began to cry havock. They attacked the citizens of Charleſton at the door of their playhouſe, cut the traces of their coach-horſes, wounded ſeveral perſons, and, if I am not miſtaken, killed one or two. The militia were called out, and the city was ſtruck with terror. Not long after an American had his ſkull cleft on board of one of their veſſels, for a pretended *inſult to their tri-coloured cockade*. Many perſons of this city of Philadelphia had the mortification to ſee their peace-officers hacked with ſwords in the middle of the ſtreet †. And yet we are now told, that "it ſeems *impoſſible* "that the Government of France ſhould attempt "any thing againſt our neutrality."

I know I ſhall be told here to make a diſtinction between the rulers in France and their miniſters in this country; and I would do this, if I ſaw the leaſt reaſon for ſo doing; if I were not well convinced that the latter have in no caſe ſurpaſſed their inſtructions. The friends of the French Government make this diſtinction, and tell us that Genet was

* The French republicans aſſert, with their uſual inſolence, that the *people* of this country began to expreſs their diſlike to Genet only when they found he was recalled. This is falſe. The democratic ſocieties indeed played him this trick; but the *people* expreſſed their deteſtation of his conduct, and that moſt unequivocally too, the inſtant he talked of his *appeal*.

† How all the offenders came to eſcape puniſhment is a queſtion to be put to the Governor of Pennſylvania and others, who ought to have ſeen the laws executed.

recalled for his miſconduct. The turbulent Miniſter was indeed *diſplaced*; but the manner of doing this fully proves, that it was a matter of expediency and not of choice. His maſters, and the maſters of unhappy France, could not reject the Preſident's requeſt, without diſguſting the people of this country, who muſt have looked on ſuch a ſtep as a decided mark of approbation of Genet's inſolence; nor could they call home without puniſhing him. Therefore, at once to preſerve the good-will of the Americans and avoid the puniſhment of a man whoſe conduct they did in reality approve of, they diſmiſſed him from his employment, and left him quietly amongſt us, where, beſides, it was poſſible for him ſtill to act, though unſeen, as the ſhowman behind the canvaſs gives movement and volubility to his puppets*.

Let it be recollected too, that Genet was diſplaced by Robeſpierre and his crew, and I leave any one to determine whether the merciful Robeſpierre, the very prince of cut-throats, could diſapprove of the plans of our Long Iſlander. The gentle Robeſpierre did indeed ſend us word that it pained his humane and generous ſoul to think that the Repreſentative of a *great* and *brave* nation ſhould ſo diſobey its will; but we ſhould have aſked this bloody villain, what he would have ſaid, if Genet had ſucceeded in his "appeal from the Preſident to the "people." Genet was diſplaced, becauſe he had failed, and not becauſe he had attempted our deſtruction. Robeſpierre has been aptly termed the *ſcape-goat* of the Convention, in France; and Genet may with equal aptneſs be termed their *ſcape-goat* in America.

---

* If ſome good ſoul would but give us a peep into the diſpatches that now and then go over to Long Iſland, we ſhould, perhaps, ſee ſome more "precious confeſſions."

The

The inſurrection in the weſtern counties of Pennſylvania was undoubtedly a great evil, but much good has been derived from it. This inſurrection was imputed to the machinations of Great Britain; and as people's ears were all open to every thing, however abſurd, that was advanced againſt that nation, it is not wonderful that many very well meaning men marched againſt the inſurgents with a full expectation of finding them under the command of the Governor of Upper Canada. This was ſinning againſt conviction certainly; but what errors will not men plunge into when blinded by prejudice and pricked on by revenge? Moſt people were heartily aſhamed of having been the dupes of this trick, long before the appearance of Citizen Fauchet's intercepted letter; but that truly ineſtimable Eſſay on bribery and corruption has placed the whole matter in a fair light, and, as the ſaying is, "clapped the ſaddle on the right horſe."

Every man who ſeeks for truth and not for falſehood, will regret with me, that we are not in poſſeſſion of the famous No. 2 and No. 6, mentioned in Citizen Fauchet's letter, and of the other diſpatches preceding that letter. Had we the peruſal of theſe precious pieces, we might enter into ſome detail: not having them, we muſt content ourſelves with proceeding like mathematicians, from the known to the unknown.

We know that the ſame man who was Secretary to the firſt Jacobin ſociety in this country, and who afterwards denied his report concerning the "appeal "from the Preſident to the people;" we know that this man is named in the intercepted letter, amongſt the three or four who were balancing to decide on their party, when the overtures for money were made to the French Miniſter.

We know that all the leaders in the inſurrection, as well as their partiſans here, were then, and are

now, the decided ſupporters of France in oppoſition to Great Britain. If we look back to the meetings of the inſurgent Committees, we ſhall there find the names of two members of the preſent Houſe of Repreſentatives; and if we turn to the *yeas* and *nays* of that Houſe, we ſhall find them both voting againſt the Britiſh treaty, and oppoſing every meaſure of the Federal Government *.

We know that poor Citizen Fauchet expreſſed his ſevere regret at the failure of the inſurrection; and ſurely we know that when a man expreſſes his regret at the failure of an enterpriſe, it is certain he wiſhed it to ſucceed. After having juſtified the cauſe of the inſurgents, and whined out their diſcomfit, he ſays, "Thus will the Government acquire ſtability, *for one* "*complete ſeſſion at leaſt!* Who knows what will be "the limits *of this triumph?* Perhaps advantage will "be taken of it to obtain ſome laws for *ſtrengthening* "*the Government!*" I was tempted to throw in an *alas* or two here; nothing elſe is wanting to render the paſſage truly pathetic; as thus: 'My dear 'maſters, in ſpite of my teeth this Government will '*laſt one ſeſſion longer at leaſt! Alas!* who knows what 'may be the limits of this triumph over our brothers? 'Perhaps the Government may be ſtrengthened, and 'then, oh hell! we ſhall never be able to knock 'it down.'

Let the reader well remember, that thoſe dreadful forebodings of Citizen Fauchet are to be found in a confidential diſpatch, intended for the peruſal of the Convention only. It is from documents like this, and not from public declarations, that we are to judge of

* When I ſaid in the Firſt Part of the *Bone to Gnaw*, that the enemies of Great Britain were invariably the enemies of the Federal Government, the good democrats affected to laugh at me: let them deny this now if they can. I defy even their impudence to deny the fact.

the

the diſpoſitions of a foreign Government. Suppoſe, for inſtance, a letter from the Britiſh Miniſter had been intercepted, containing expreſſions of his regret at the ſucceſs of the Government in quelling the inſurrection, and juſtifying the conduct of the inſurgents—what would then have been ſeen? Need I aſk this? Poor man! The Lord have mercy upon him, if he had remained here after the diſcovery. Our language is copious, and particularly in terms of execration; but I am miſtaken if enough would have been found. Thoſe who talk High-Dutch would have had an advantage, as it is ſaid a man can curſe harder in that language than in any other.

Fauchet was recalled; and as no miſconduct was imputed to him, he went home, you ſee. But here is one circumſtance that I muſt beg the good reader to attend to, and that is, that Citizen Joſeph was called away *after a defeat*, juſt as his renowned predeceſſor was. As ſoon as it was known in France, that Father Joſeph's fatal diſpatch had fallen into the hands of the Engliſh Miniſtry, it was perceived that the writer would become odious here; that he would always be ſuſpected by the Government, and that his friends would be afraid to truſt their *precious confeſſions* to his ear. How kind was it then to recall him, and ſend another, whom no mortal man could ever think of ſuſpecting? No, certainly not; it would be hard, indeed, to ſuſpect a third. The moſt unfortunate gamblers reckon with confidence upon a good throw out of three*.

The

* Having ſtumbled upon the word *Gamblers*, it puts me in mind of the *Faro Banks*, *Gaming Tables* and *Gambling Lotteries*, in all about two hundred, now in this city. Theſe noble inſtitutions we owe entirely to the French; and when we add to theſe the paganiſh calendar, and the Age of Reaſon, muſt we not bluſh to think that theſe generous enlighteners of the world are ſtill obliged

The third (and I hope the laſt) fair trial of the ſtrength of French influence was the attempt to ſet aſide the Britiſh treaty. Here it failed alſo; but we are not to conclude that, becauſe it failed, it never was made. For my part, I am confident the trial was made, and have not the leaſt doubt that it would have ſucceeded, had it not been for a *diſappointment*.

It would be uſeleſs to repeat here what has been ſo often ſaid reſpecting the conduct of poor Mr. Randolph, at the time of the ratification, or, to go over all the manœuvres of the partiſans of France, from the moment the treaty firſt arrived in this country till the meeting of Congreſs. Still leſs neceſſary is it to enter into a detailed account of what has paſſed ſince that time, as it is freſh in every one's memory. One fact, however, I muſt relate here, as it is well worthy of attention.

In the *Cenſor* for April, it was remarked, that "the petition againſt the treaty, ſaid to be ſigned by fifteen hundred citizens of Philadelphia, was carried round for ſignature by a *Frenchman*." To this I have now to add, that in the State of New Jerſey, two *Frenchmen* went about ſoliciting ſignatures to another petition of the ſame import. The perſon who was ſo obliging as to furniſh this information, ſaw them at a public houſe preſſing people to ſign. He was himſelf prevailed on to do ſo; but thinking, upon recollection, that he had done wrong, he returned to the houſe and ſcratched out his name. Would to God that numbers of his countrymen were as ready to correct their errors!

---

to cry out on our *ingratitude?* How much better are all theſe pretty things than the naſty broad-cloths and linens we get from thoſe ſad dogs the Britiſh! And yet we make a treaty with them! O fye!

After

After having given this ſhort ſketch of the hiſtory of French influence down to the time when, as our Paris intelligence ſtates, it was to break out into action, let us compare that intelligence with the ſituation of things on this ſide of the water. A few ſentences will ſuffice.

The ſubſtance of the Paris intelligence is this: "that certain influential men in America had entered into a negotiation with the French Government, the reſult of which was, France was to oblige the Executive of the United States to abandon the treaty with Great Britain, by threatening it with a war in caſe of refuſal; but that this project, the writer believed to be laid aſide *on the 14th of February*." On the 24th of March, Mr. Livingſton's motion paſſed by a majority of *twenty-five*. This was only 38 days after France had given up the project. On the 28th of April, 35 days later, this *frightful majority* changed into a *minority*, and the treaty paſſed very quietly. This was 63 days after France had given up the project. So that it is poſſible that this might be known when the latter vote was taken, and not when the former one was.

I by no means pretend to ſay, that any unfavourable news from France had an influence on theſe votes; on the contrary, I am, alas! (as Citizen Fauchet ſays) too well convinced of the purity of the Oppoſition, to ſuppoſe that they, or any of them, could be the "*influential men*" hinted at in the extract. No, no; God forbid I ſhould think any ſuch thing. Mercy on us all! they, poor men, changed their votes becauſe their conſtituents changed their notes. It is theſe conſtituents who are to blame then, and, of courſe, the "*influential men*" are to be found among them. Now conſtituents are every body, and every body is nobody; and thus you ſee, reader, we all of us draw ourſelves decently out of the ſcrape.

Letter

Letter from GOVERNOR SHELBY, *to* OLIVER WOLCOTT, *Secretary of the Treaſury.*

SIR,

I have been informed, that in a letter addreſſed by you during the laſt ſeſſion of Congreſs to the Chairman of a Committee of the Houſe of Repreſentatives, you ſtated, "that for want of a diſtrict attorney in Kentucky, no duties could be collected; that the Governor himſelf refuſed to pay; and that the people ſheltered themſelves under his example. For the ſatisfaction of the public, I ſhall ſtate a few facts concerning this buſineſs: I rented out my diſtillery in Auguſt, 1792; previous to which, no application had been made to me by any exciſe officer to meaſure my ſtills, or to take an entry of them; I continued to rent out my ſtills from that time until the latter end of the year 1793, and the tenants gave me their bonds to keep me indemnified from any demands that might be made on me for the exciſe during that period. I then took them again into my poſſeſſion, and commenced working of them in January, 1794. About the month of April following, I was applied to by an exciſe officer (for the firſt time) for the duties of that year. I informed him of the time I had taken my diſtillery into poſſeſſion, and that I did not conceive any duties could then be due from the time I had commenced working my diſtillery; which he appeared ſatisfied with. He removed ſhortly afterwards out of the country, and there was not (to my knowledge) an exciſe officer in it until about the month of January or February, 1795. I was then called upon to make an entry of my ſtills from June, 1794, which I did immediately: After I had done this, the officer aſked me if I would pay the arrearages. I told him I did not know whether the law required it of me, that I would take counſel on the ſubject; and that if I found the law did require it of me, that I would pay them on the firſt application, other-

wiſe I would not. He ſaid he was not bound to call a ſecond time to demand them: I told him if he did not chooſe to do ſo, he might execute his duty immediately, and take my property. This he did not do, but went away. I was ſhortly afterwards adviſed that the law would not compel me to pay the arrearages; but when the duties from June, 1794, to June, 1795, became due, I counted out and laid by itſelf the amount of what was due from me for that period, that the officer, when he called again, might have occaſion to ſtay as ſhort a time as poſſible in my houſe. No application of any kind has ſince that time been made to me by any exciſe officer; and I found upon inquiry that I could not procure a permit to remove whiſkey which I had diſtilled between June, 1794, and June, 1795, owing to the want of an officer in the county. I have very lately been obliged to apply perſonally to the officer who is at this time acting in the county, to receive the taxes due from me for that period, and from June, 1795, to June, 1796.

From this ſtatement of facts, the public will find that your aſſertion, as far as it concerns me, is falſe; and I believe it to be equally groundleſs, as far as it concerns the diſtillers in general within this State. I have no doubt but that it will be found, upon an impartial inquiry, that the diſtillers have paid conſiderable ſums on account of the exciſe; and that it has been owing to the neglect or miſconduct of the officers of Government, that the duties have not been univerſally collected from June, 1794.

It is a matter of indifference to me whether you fabricated your falſe ſtatement yourſelf, or received it from others: having made it, you are reſponſible for the truth of it: but as the diſtance between us renders a perſonal application to you impracticable, I ſhall upon this, and all future occaſions, where you may uſe my name improperly, take the liberty

of

of aſſuring you, in this public manner, that I deſpiſe you moſt heartily.

ISAAC SHELBY.

To ISAAC SHELBY, *late Governor of Kentucky.*

SIR,

Having very unexpectedly met with a publication of yours addreſſed to Oliver Wolcott, I could not avoid reading it, becauſe I like to know whatever is ſaid to or of public officers in high ſtation; eſpecially by one who has been, or is himſelf in office. I found it was intended to refute a charge, which you ſay was made againſt you, *of having refuſed to pay the exciſe.* Judge then with what regret, as a friend of yours, I perceived, that your own words furniſh the fulleſt evidence of your guilt. My dear Sir, I would have you conſider (and I wiſh I had been by you to have ſaid it, before you thus committed yourſelf), that the public, for whoſe ſatisfaction you were ſo good as to write, is made up, as relative to yourſelf, of two ſorts of people, that is to ſay, friends and foes; and that while you ſhould cautiouſly avoid furniſhing matter of ſcandal to the latter, you ſhould be no leſs careful not to render your defence too difficult for the former. In the preſent caſe, Sir, the weight of this obſervation is felt with different kinds, but equal degrees of ſenſibility on both ſides; there being much ſubject of ridicule or ſlander, while there is but little ground for defence. For example—Had you ſaid, That as for what Oliver Wolcott has ſaid of me, it is a damned lie! and I deſpiſe him, whether he made it or not; and added nothing more, your enemies could only have ſaid, that you were an inconſiderate, vulgar blackguard, which you know would have been true enough. But then your friends, admitting that, would have believed you, and all to a man would have ſtood up for your credibility. But, alas!

alas! what are they now to think, what can they ſay, when you ſtate, as a part of the charge againſt you (and the material part), "That the Governor himſelf refuſed to pay?" and in another place admit, that, when required to pay, you *declined?*—a modeſt word for *refuſed*, to be ſure. You wanted counſel—if the law required it, you would pay; otherwiſe you would not. You took counſel—you were adviſed not to pay, and you did not pay. Now what were you charged with? That you refuſed to pay.—What have you admitted? That you refuſed to pay.—What have the people done? Refuſed to pay. They too had legal advice! Yet you tell Mr. Wolcott that the charge is falſe. You muſt perceive, Sir, from all this, that it is as difficult to defend your reputation for veracity, as it is to prove you a polite gentleman. Indeed, Sir, permit me to add, and be aſſured that I do it with much reluctance, that your friends, driven to deſpair, find themſelves obliged to abandon you in both points to the pity or contempt of your enemies. Yet, Sir, there are other points in your caſe, which intereſt them extremely, and upon which they promiſe to beſtow their beſt endeavours, being fully impreſſed with the truth of an obſervation, that there are but few characters wholly deſtitute of merit, or any cauſe ſo bad, as not to furniſh ſome favourable topics.

You, Sir, have aſſumed as a part of the charge, "that the people ſheltered themſelves under your example;" and this you deny. Now, Sir, how much better it would have been, had you paſſed this part of the ſubject over in ſilence! For you know that the people did refuſe to pay; but this, it is admitted, you do not mean to deny. You deny only, "that they ſheltered themſelves under your example;" and admitting, alſo, that you were ſo inſignificant in common eſtimation, as to render your example of no influence; yet I find it impoſſible, with all my inge-

nuity, to defend your confeffion of the fact, from the imputation of weakneſs, or to reconcile it to that love of notice and diſtinction, which is but too obvious to be denied, even in your addreſs to Mr. Wolcott.

Again, Sir, it is ſaid, that your ſtatement of facts is partial and unconnected; from whence is inferred your want of honeſty toward that public for whoſe ſatisfaction you profeſs to make it. You may be ſure that I demanded with promptitude an inſtance that could give riſe to ſo groſs a calumny as I then thought it. For, however irritable, imprudent, raſh, or rude, you may be, I could have vouched againſt the world for your candour. What then muſt have been my confuſion, when it was remarked, that you had taken particular notice that no officer had called on you to meaſure or take entry of your ſtills, as an apology for not paying within a period, which the law made it the duty of the diſtiller to call at an office and make entry of his ſtills? Now, Sir, did you, while the law required it of you, as the owner of ſtills, make lawful entry at the office? If you did, you ſhould have ſaid ſo. If you did not, then why do you repreſent that the officer did not do what you ſhould have done?

Sir, there are many other obſervations made on your letter, which the compaſs I have preſcribed to myſelf will not permit me to notice: at the ſame time, there are others which are too flagrant to eſcape attention. I have not a word to ſay about the conduct of the officers of exciſe, not even for Mr. Wolcott; I leave that to themſelves and their betters, any further than I think you concerned.

You ſay, "it is a matter of indifference to you whether Mr. Wolcott fabricated his falſehood, or received it from others"—that he was equally reſponſible; and that as you could not ſee him perſonally, you would tell him publicly, that you deſpiſed him moſt

moſt heartily—that is as much as you could. Now, for ſhame! what a groſs idea you preſent us of your morality! What! make no difference between a man's fabricating a falſehood, and his tranſmitting information in the line of his duty, which he might have received with evidences of truth ſufficient to induce his belief! Is it, Sir, owing to this want of diſcrimination in moral ſubjects, that you ſo little regard what you write yourſelf? And do you believe that the public will as readily excuſe you for a falſehood of your own making, as if you barely reported what you had heard and believed? If you do, then we can diſcern your conſiſtency. If you do not, then learn to judge as you would be judged.

Having, Sir, thus gone over the moſt embarraſſing parts of your publication, and incidentally noticed ſuch obſervations as have occurred, I find myſelf much relieved by the proſpect of ground much more tenable, and which I ſhall now make haſte to occupy.

It is this, Sir, that, although you have *declined*, that is, *refuſed* to pay the exciſe, previous to June, 1794, you have entered your ſtills from that time, and are now diſpoſed to pay. Nay, ſo anxious have you been to pay, that *lately* you called on the officer for that purpoſe. Now what can you ſay, you vile calumniators! againſt Governor Shelby? Dare you aſk if he entered his ſtills before the inſurrection in the weſtern parts of Pennſylvania was quelled? He tells you he entered them in 1795. Dare you aſk, when he paid the firſt exciſe? He tells you that he lately offered to pay it. Was this after he was told what Mr. Wolcott had ſaid of him? Huſh your impertinence! Was Governor Shelby a friend to the democratic ſocieties? Did he countenance the project of Genet, to raiſe an armed force in Kentucky? Let him alone! he is on the ſtool of repentance. Don't you perceive how much aſhamed he

he is of his former conduct, and how he labours to excuse it? Have you not already assurances of his reformation? Do you not discern in him the timid sinner who has not virtue enough to avoid a crime—nor effrontery sufficient to avow it? Let him alone! there is an attorney appointed to that district; and so long as he can be made to fear the lash of the law, the United States may count with certainty upon his fidelity.

And now, Sir, if I have written as much to the public as yourself, I have your example for so doing, which, if not my pride, must be my apology *.

A. B.

The Author's Complaint.—The following complaint is taken from Brown's Gazette. "The author" is a hair-dresser, named MURDOCK, who (poor man!) dreamt, in evil hour, that he was born a poet. Of his play it may be truly said, that it is the most abominable nonsense that ever issued from the skull of a coxcomb, a *republican* coxcomb, who is always ten degrees more foolish than coxcombs of any other species. But, to the complaint.

"MR. BROWN, Knowing that a great number of citizens are daily expecting to hear 'The Triumphs of Love, or Happy Reconciliation,' announced for performance, it is requisite they should be informed how that piece is situated by a fair recital of facts.

"Occasionally visiting the theatre, I was at times much disgusted to see and hear pieces performed *so foreign to the circumstances of a republican people*, which excited me, at my *leisure moments*, to *throw my ideas into a train, to produce a drama*, which would

---

* This letter is now first published (in the Porcupine's Works), from the manuscript which was handed to me just after Shelby's letter appeared in the public papers of Philadelphia.

be

be conſonant to the *ears of Americans.* Upon accompliſhing a piece, and aware of the *foible of human nature* of being too partial to what originates with ourſelves, I put it for peruſal into the hands of ſeveral perſons, moſt of whom I knew to be *judges of that peculiar ſpecies of writing.* It was returned with *high encomiums.* I was requeſted by them to ſubmit it to the managers of the New Theatre. I purſued their advice; it lay with them ſome weeks—they finally *rejected it.* I informed the gentlemen of their deciſion; they were *not a little ſurpriſed,* and expreſſed themſelves in terms of *indignation:* there matters reſted—the piece was thrown aſide, to ſleep, as I ſuppoſe, the ſleep of death. The *flower* was *born,* and born, as I expected, to *bluſh unſeen* for ever from public view; but upon the opening the New Theatre on the enſuing ſeaſon, I was again requeſted by the alluded-to friends of the piece, to preſent it once more to the managers. I replied, it was in vain; *comparatively ſpeaking,* it would be like oppoſing a feather to a ſtrong *north-weſter.* I told them I thought I diſcovered a confirmed temper in the managers to trample upon *native productions*; they wiſhed me to give it up to them, and leave it to *their management:* I accordingly did. They waited upon the managers with it—were promiſed by them to pay it due attention. It remained with them a length of time without receiving a direct anſwer, though they were frequently importuned to give one, or return the play. At laſt, beyond the eleventh hour, it was *ſhoved* into the world moſt unmercifully diſſected, by what was called by the managers "neceſſary expunging;" yet, notwithſtanding its mutilated ſtate, it was received with the *ſtrongeſt marks of approbation,* by one of the moſt reſpectable audiences the houſe ever contained. That, and the *flattering compliments* I had paid me the next day, joined with the deſire

of many to have it printed, induced me to have it publiſhed: *by ſo doing I am out of pocket.* Some time *agone* I ſent the managers a *ſecond compoſition*—a farce, in two acts. I informed them how I was circumſtanced with reſpect to the firſt, and obſerved, if they played the two in concert, with ſpirit, there was no doubt, that, in all *human probability*, they would have an *overflowing houſe*, and would give a ſtart *to the ſale* of my firſt piece: but they were not diſpoſed to perform either. The reaſons given were not ſupported by the moſt forcible arguments.

I ſhall conclude, by aſſerting to the managers, in the *full face* of the public, that the Triumphs of Love, or Happy Reconciliation, with the imperfections which they or thoſe *who influence them*, may charge it with, as it was well received in the firſt inſtance, has an undoubted right of taking its place or chance in the early part of this ſeaſon with other pieces *.

THE AUTHOR.

The following is the letter received by the Committee of Congreſs appointed to inquire into the ſituation of the ſon of General La Fayette:

" *Ramapagh, New-Jerſey, March* 28, 1796.

[TRANSLATION.]

" SIR, I have juſt received the honourable reſolution, which the merits of my father have procured for me. Deign to expreſs to the Repreſentatives of the people of America *his* gratitude: my youth forbids me yet to ſpeak of mine. Every day recalls to

* In ſpite of all this, the poor barber's play, which, incredible as it may ſeem, was worſe than the worſt of Reynolds's or Moreton's, was condemned to everlaſting obſcurity.

me what he taught me, at every period of his life, ſo full of viciſſitude, and what he has repeated in a letter, written from the depth of his priſon: 'I am convinced (he ſays), that the goodneſs of the United States, and the tenderneſs of my paternal friend, will need nothing to excite them.'

"Arrived in America, ſome months ſince, I live in the country, in New-Jerſey, occupied in the purſuits of my education. I have no wants; if I had felt any, I ſhould have anſwered to the paternal ſolicitude of the Preſident of the United States, either by confiding them to him, or by accepting his offers. I ſhall hereafter conſider it a duty to impart them to the Houſe of Repreſentatives, which deigns to inquire into my ſituation.

"I am as happy as a continual inquietude relative to the object of my firſt affections will permit. I have found benevolence wherever I have been known, and have often had the ſatisfaction of hearing thoſe who were ignorant of my connexions, ſpeak of their intereſt in the fate of my father, expreſs their admiration of, and partake the gratitude I feel for the generous Dr. Bullman, who has done ſo much to break his chains.

"It is amid all theſe motives of emulation, that I ſhall continue my ſtudies; every day more convinced of the duties which are impoſed by the goodneſs of Congreſs, and the names I have the honour to bear,

"GEO. WASHINGTON MOTIER LA FAYETTE.

"*The Hon. Edward Livingſton,*

"*Chairman, &c.*"

I have no objection to this young ſprig of rebellion being ſupported by the *Whigs* of America; they were weak and wicked enough to employ the father, and they ought to have the charge of ſupporting the children entailed upon them unto the third and fourth generation; but I ſee no reaſon why thoſe

who never accepted of the ſervices of the father, ſhould be *compelled* to pay towards the maintenance of the ſon. Why ſhould the honeſt and peaceable part of the people of America be taxed for the purpoſe of giving a ſplendid eſtabliſhment to a French boy? If Livingſton and others of the ſame ſtamp have ſuch a regard for Fayette as they pretend to have, let them put their hands in their *own* pockets, and not rob the farmers of America, who neither know nor care any thing about the deſcendants of the wretch that betrayed his king, and plunged his country into miſery. That generoſity is very cheap, which is gratified by giving away the money of others. There is, indeed, an apology for Ned Livingſton, who might probably put his hand in his pocket, twice before he would find a dollar; but let him then ſuppreſs his *generous* feelings, till his own debts are paid, and not ſquander away the money of the public.

Beſides, if the public money is to be beſtowed on thoſe who rendered ſervice to the cauſe of the rebellion, why are not the poor Iriſh and Americans to have ſome ſmall ſhare of it? How many hundreds and thouſands of the poor fellows who fought for "*liberty*," have now the mortification to come begging in vain for a trifling relief from the men for whoſe exaltation they were ſtupid enough to ſacrifice their time, their property, their health, and their limbs? There are hundreds, who were *commiſſioned officers* even, during the whole of the rebellion, and who are now in miſery the moſt complete. As an inſtance of this kind, I here inſert the copy of a begging petition, which a moſt miſerable-looking creature preſented at my door about ſix weeks ago.

" *To Thomas M'Kean, Esq. Doctor of Laws, and Chief*
" *Justice of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.*

" The humble petition of John Lochman, surgeon, during the late war, in the army of the " United States, humbly sheweth, that your petitioner, having almost lost the use of his limbs, " by the exertions which he made, and the hardships which he suffered *in the glorious cause of liberty and independence*; and being now poor and " pennyless, having had his bed sold from under " him, and his aged wife, &c. &c. &c."

Then followed this certificate:

" We do certify, that we have long known the " above John Lochman, and that we know his case " to be what it is stated in his petition.

(Signed) " Robert Harris.
" John Steel.
" Henry Hornberger."

" *I do not see why charitable persons may not contribute to the support of the above John Lochman*, and " I have given him *a dollar!* (4*s.* 3*d.* sterling.)

(Signed) " Thomas M'Kean."

" *Philadelphia*,
" 24*th October*, 1794."

This requires no comment. It is a wholesome lesson to those who may in future be tempted to bear arms against their lawful sovereign. Had this poor man been a *loyalist* soldier, he would not have been left to beg his bread in his old age, and to receive a pitiful alms from a little, upstart tyrant, whose *charity* even is bestowed in a manner well calculated to kill the receiver of it.

I shall close this Censor with recording an account of the rejoicings for peace, in the city of Philadelphia, in the year 1783. After the Reader has gone through it, let him recollect that, on the very spot where the triumphal arch was erected, and where

Louis the XVIth was thus flattered, even there, at this very moment, the citizens of Philadelphia are entertained, amuſed, and delighted, with an exhibition of this ſame Louis XVI. ſuffering, in effigy, under the axe of the guillotine, which forty times a day ſevers his head from his body, amidſt the applauding ſhouts of thoſe who crawled to him like ſpaniels in the year 1783! A ſtriking inſtance of the baſeneſs and ingratitude of Republicans.

Philadelphia.—In Aſſembly, Tueſday, December 2d, 1783, A. M.

The report of the Committee, read November 29th, relative to the preparations to be made for public demonſtrations of joy, was read the ſecond time, and adopted as follows, viz.

The Committee appointed to confer with Council concerning the public demonſtrations of joy it may now be proper to authorize in this State, upon the definitive treaty of peace between the United States and Great Britain, beg leave to report, as the joint opinion of that Board and your Committee—

That a triumphal arch be erected at the upper end of High or Market Street, between Sixth and Seventh Streets, to be embelliſhed with illuminated paintings and ſuitable inſcriptions; and that ſome fireworks be prepared for the occaſion.

That ſuch an exhibition, in point of elegance, as well as in regard to the convenience and ſafety of the ſpectators, will prove moſt generally acceptable; it being intended there ſhould be no other illumination in the city: that theſe preparations may be completed in three or four weeks, and will require, by the moſt exact computation they could at preſent make, about five or at moſt ſix hundred pounds: And therefore,

Reſolved, That a ſum not exceeding ſix hundred pounds be, and is hereby appropriated for the purpoſe of enabling the ſupreme Executive Council to make public demonſtrations of joy upon the definitive treaty of peace between the United States and Great Britain.

As theſe demonſtrations of joy are preſcribed and regulated by the directions and at the expenſe of the State, it is expected, that no perſon or perſons whatever will preſume, in defiance of the authority of the Commonwealth, to require or to make any other demonſtrations of joy upon the occaſion, than thoſe directed and authorized as aforeſaid.

A Deſcription of the Triumphal Arch and its Ornaments.

The arch is fifty feet and ſix inches wide, and thirty-five feet and ſix inches high, excluſive of the baluſtrade, which is three feet and nine inches in height. The arch is fourteen feet wide in the

the clear, and each of the ſmaller arches nine feet. The pillars are of the *Ionic* order. The entablature, all the other parts, and the proportions, correſpond with that order; and the whole edifice is finiſhed in the ſtyle of architecture proper for ſuch a building, and uſed by the Romans. The pillars are adorned by ſpiral feſtoons of flowers in their natural colours.

The following devices and inſcriptions are diſtributed in the ſeveral parts appropriated by the ancients to ſuch ornaments.

I. Over the centre arch, the temple of Janus ſhut.

Numine favente
Magnus ab integro ſæculorum naſcitur ordo.
By the Divine favour
A great and new order of ages commences.

II. On the ſouth ſide of the baluſtrade, a buſt of Louis XVI.

Merendo memores facit.
His merit makes us remember him.

III. On the other ſide of the baluſtrade, a pyramidal cenotaph to the memory of thoſe brave men who have died for their country in the late war.

Ob patriam pugnando vulnera paſſi.
Theſe received their wounds for their country.

IV. On the ſouth ſide of the frize, three lilies, the arms of France.

Gloriam ſuperant.
They exceed glory.

V. On the left of the former, a plough, ſheaves of wheat, and a ſhip under ſail, the arms of Pennſylvania.

Terra ſuis contenta bonis.
A land contented with its own bleſſings.

VI. On the left of the preceding, a ſun, the device of France, —and thirteen ſtars, the device of the United States.

Cœlo ſociati.
Allied in the heavens.

VII. On the left of the laſt, two hands joined, holding branches of olive and the caduceus of commerce.

Concordia gentium.
The concord of nations.

VIII. On the ſouth pannel, confederated America leaning upon a ſoldier, military trophies on each ſide of them.

Fides exercitûs.
The fidelity of the army.

IX. On the other pannel, Indians building churches in the wilderneſs.

Ponunt ferocia corda.
Their ſavage hearts become mild.

X. On the dye of the ſouth pedeſtal, a library, with inſtruments and emblems of arts and ſciences.

Emolliunt mores.
Theſe ſoften manners.

XI.

XI. On the dye of the next pedeſtal, a large tree bearing thirteen principal and diſtinct branches loaded with fruit.

Robore ſtipitis maturabunt.

By the ſtrength of the body theſe will ripen.

XII. On the dye of the pedeſtal upon the right hand in paſſing through the centre arch, Cincinnatus, crowned with laurel, returning to his plough—the plough adorned with a wreath of the ſame—the countenance of Cincinnatus is a ſtriking reſemblance of General Waſhington.

Victrix virtus.

Victorious virtue.

XIII. On the dye of the next pedeſtal, militia exerciſing.

Protegentes gaudebunt.

Protecting they ſhall enjoy.

On the ſpandrels of the centre arch theſe letters, S. P. Q. P.

The Senate and People of Pennſylvania.

The top of the baluſtrade is embelliſhed with figures repreſenting the cardinal Virtues, Juſtice, Prudence, Temperance, and Fortitude.

The whole building illuminated by about twelve hundred lamps.

Directions will be put up in Market Street near Fifth Street, for having the following regulations obſerved, in order that the citizens may have an opportunity of viewing and examining the exhibition with the greateſt convenience and ſatisfaction to themſelves:

1ſt, Perſons walking will pleaſe to advance towards the exhibition by the ways on the outſide of the foot-pavements, which lead in ſtraight lines from Fifth Street through the ſide arches. Thoſe that advance on the ſouth ſide, after paſſing the ſouth arch, will turn on the left hand down Market Street on the foot-pavement to Fifth Street. Thoſe who advance on the north ſide, after paſſing the north arch, will turn on the right hand down Market Street on the foot-pavement to Fifth Street. In this manner they may paſs and return as often as they chooſe.

2d, Perſons on horſeback or in carriages are to advance in the middle of Market Street, and paſſing through the centre arch, continue on to Seventh Street; then turning to the right or left, return by Arch Street or Cheſnut Street, to Fifth Street, and ſo paſs and return as often as they pleaſe.

Any boys or others, who diſturb the citizens by throwing ſquibs or crackers, or otherwiſe, will be immediately apprehended and ſent to the workhouſe! ! !

THE END OF CENSOR, NO. IV.

AND OF

VOLUME III.

BINDING SECT. FEB 7 1983

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

19